

2730. By Mr. KURTZ: Petition of citizens of Altoona, Pa., favoring early passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, to increase the pensions of certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

2731. By Mr. MCCLINTOCK of Ohio: Petition of 27 members of Daughters of Union Veterans, of Wooster, Ohio, favoring increase of pension for their fathers and mothers; to the Committee on Pensions.

2732. By Mr. MENGES: Petition submitted by members of the Capt. E. M. Ruhl Camp, No. 33, and the auxiliary of the Capt. E. M. Ruhl Camp, urging the passage of a bill asking for an increase of pension for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2733. Also, petition submitted by the members of the Theodore Pfeiffer Camp, No. 60, of New Oxford, Pa., urging the passage of a bill granting an increase of pension for Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2734. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition signed by Eliza L. Pye, Braymer, Mo., and other citizens of Caldwell County, Mo., asking for additional relief for veterans and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2735. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Rochester, Ky., and Butler County, Ky., urging passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing increase in pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2736. By Mr. MOUSER: Petition of citizens of Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2737. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of James J. Nickles, of Barnesville, Ohio, and 65 other residents of that city, asking for the speedy consideration and passage of the Spanish-American pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

2738. By Mr. PALMER: Petition of Mrs. Lee Anna E. Stone, of Strafford, Mo., and numerous citizens of that section, urging the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2739. By Mr. RAGON: Petition of Charles T. Jones and other citizens of Little Rock, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2740. Also, petition of George Leming and other citizens of Russellville, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2741. Also, petition of W. H. Russell and other citizens of Little Rock, Ark., urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pensions to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2742. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of C. A. Wasson, Myrtle Brown, et al., of Hannibal, Mo., asking for the establishment of a national department of public education; to the Committee on Education.

2743. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of H. Robberstad, Richard A. Nelson, and 41 other residents of Warroad, Minn., urging Congress to increase pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2744. Also, petition asking for increased pension rates for veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2745. By Mr. SHORT of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Neelyville, Butler County, Mo., urging increased pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2746. By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of B. B. Smith and 73 other signers in support of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2747. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of 62 residents of Williston, N. Dak., and vicinity, urging an increase in pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2748. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by F. R. Slusher, H. G. Rideout, Lloyd F. Pearson, and other citizens of Yakima, Wash., in support of legislation in behalf of Spanish War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 10, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6344) to amend title 28, section 192, United States Code, in respect to the terms of court in the western judicial district of Virginia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	Keyes	Shortridge
Ashurst	George	King	Simmons
Baird	Gillett	McCulloch	Smith
Bingham	Glass	McKellar	Smoot
Black	Goff	McMaster	Stelwer
Blaine	Gould	McNary	Sullivan
Blease	Greene	Metcalf	Swanson
Borah	Grundy	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Brock	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Tydings
Broussard	Hatfield	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hawes	Overman	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Patterson	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Dill	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fess	Kean	Schall	
Fletcher	Kendrick	Sheppard	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RADIO BROADCASTING LICENSES (S. DOC. NO. 67)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Radio Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 166, additional information mentioned in letter dated December 11, 1929, together with a table which supersedes the tabulation dated December 10, 1929, and gives the information in a clearer and more concise manner, which, with the accompanying data, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PETITIONS

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition of sundry citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TYDINGS presented petitions of sundry citizens of the city and county of Baltimore, Md., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Spanish War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

DUTY ON SILVER

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the Tonopah Mine Operators' Association on the 4th instant, relative to the falling price of silver and suggesting a remedy therefor, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution unanimously passed by the executive committee of the Tonopah Mine Operators' Association on January 4, 1930:

"Whereas owing to the depressed price of silver which, if same continues, will have the effect of closing all the mines in the Tonopah mining district; and

"Whereas the district has in the past produced more than 200,000,000 ounces of silver and can produce much more should silver sell at a reasonable price: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association commit itself to the whole-hearted support of Senators PITTMAN and ODDIE and Congressman ARENTZ, of this State, in their effort to obtain an import duty of 30 cents per ounce on this metal and such other relief as seems necessary and advisable. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator PITTMAN, Senator ODDIE, and Congressman ARENTZ, also a copy to the Nevada Mine Operators' Association, requesting that they use their best efforts in assisting our Senators and Congressman with this matter."

CENSORSHIP OF IMPORTED BOOKS

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have read at the desk a letter from the American Library Association on the question of the censorship of imported books. I do not believe the letter has been previously placed in the RECORD. I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, January 8, 1930.

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BORAH: It is my pleasure and official duty to inform you of the following action taken by the council of the American Library Association on December 31, 1929, which, I believe, expresses the sentiments of practically all of the more than 12,000 members of the American Library Association:

The council of the American Library Association, regularly assembled at its midwinter meeting in Chicago, December 31, 1929, bespeaks your earnest support of Senator CUTTING's amendment to section 305 of the tariff bill relating to the importation of books.

Quite obviously the American Library Association does not favor either obscenity or revolution, but neither is it willing to place a censorship in the hands of customs officials whose established record in this matter borders on the absurd.

Books which are essential to American scholarship have already been banned by customs clerks. Under the original provisions of section 305, eliminated by Senator CUTTING's amendment but now proposed for reinstatement by other interests, this condition would become intolerable.

With prohibitory statutes in most States, and with many voluntary organizations seeking to censor the Nation's reading, the American Library Association sees no need for further Federal action.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. MILAM, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will lie on the table.

THE NATIONAL BANKING SYSTEM AND CHAIN BANKING

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency a letter from Mr. Hugh L. McElderry, president of the Talladega National Bank, of Talladega, Ala., on the national banking system and its relation to chain banking.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TALLADEGA NATIONAL BANK,
Talladega, Ala., December 30, 1929.

Hon. HUGO BLACK,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is an outrage on my part to trouble you again over the national banking system, but we are confronted with the fact that the small national bank must do one of two things, viz: Sell to a chain, and if we do, the result will be:

1. Ownership by a few men and with control in New York.
2. The elimination in every community of the financially strong men who in times of panic throw their influence and fortunes in the balance to protect their respective communities.

3. The elimination of double liability of stockholders, as when the bank chain fails the trust holding the stock of the chain is bankrupt.

4. The recent sale of stocks and debentures of little value to the public by affiliated companies of the "big banks" proves to a demonstration they can not be trusted to protect the 90 per cent of our people now owning 10 per cent of the wealth of the United States.

5. Big banks do fail, and when chain systems owned by them fail, we will have panic such as we have never known.

If we small national bankers do not sell to a chain, then comes going into the State bank system, but you are aware of two things:

1. State banks in emergencies have not been satisfactory fiscal agents of the Federal Government.

2. Forty-eight divers systems of bank control do not work for efficiency; so it would seem the national banking system should be reserved and made more efficient.

Small national banks are not in a happy condition, as few of them show any profit for last six months, and while this is so, Max Wellborn tells me the reserve system has turned into the Federal treasury \$100,000,000, while we stockholders have received only 6 per cent on our stock. What has hurt the small national banker in last six months has been:

1. Sale of worthless stocks and debentures to our customers by high-pressure salesmen of the big banks.

2. Our leading citizens—men and women—now patronize bucket shops and buy stuff of small value through these bucket shops, while our customers are told, "No need to go to your bankers for advice, as he will tell you to keep your money in savings account." Women who have lost their all are coming in now and telling this to us.

While the national banking system has been practically eliminated by withdrawal of the big banks, and small banks being forced to go into chains, there is an imperious necessity, as I see it, for immediate and careful investigation of the matter by you men in authority.

Respectfully yours,

HUGH L. McELDERRY.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN FREIGHT RATES

Mr. McKELLAR. I present a resolution adopted by the mayor and board of commissioners of the city of Memphis in regard to the increase in freight rates on road material, which I move be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution

Whereas the President of the United States has requested the governments of the various States, counties, and municipalities to carry on all necessary public works; and

Whereas the State of Tennessee and the various political subdivisions thereof have acquiesced in this request; and

Whereas the railroads operating in the Mississippi Valley are endeavoring to secure a vastly increased freight rate on building materials used in the building of roads and public buildings; and

Whereas said increased freight rates have been tentatively approved by referee under the Interstate Commerce Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the mayor and board of commissioners of the city of Memphis, do hereby solemnly protest against said proposed increase in freight rates which will take from the taxpayers of Tennessee and the Mississippi Valley millions of dollars collected for the building of roads and public improvements and pay same into the treasuries of the railroads operating in this valley; be it further

Resolved, That we protest against the policy of the railroads in seeking this increase in freight rates on materials essential for the building of highways, when said railroads have prospered and gained their prosperity through the progress and development of the people of the Mississippi Valley; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the city clerk of the city of Memphis to the President of the United States, the United States Senators representing the State of Tennessee, the Governor of the State of Tennessee, and the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

STATE OF TENNESSEE,

County of Shelby, city of Memphis.

I, D. C. Miller, hereby certify that I am the regularly elected, qualified, and acting city clerk of Memphis and that the foregoing resolution was approved by the board of commissioners of the city of Memphis at its meeting held January 7, 1930, and is duly recorded in minute book M under said date.

This 7th day of January, 1930.

[SEAL]

D. C. MILLER,
City Clerk of Memphis, Tenn.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2515) allowing the rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army, or of a captain, Medical Corps, United States Navy, to any medical officer below such rank assigned to duty as physician to the White House, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 72) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) author-

izing the use of tribal moneys belonging to the Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota for certain purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 73) thereon.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. FLETCHER, as in open executive session, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported sundry nominations in the Army, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3067) for the relief of the estate of Edward H. Ozmun, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS (by request):

A bill (S. 3068) to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN:

A bill (S. 3069) granting a pension to Curtis Miller (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 3070) for the relief of Margaret Doyle, administratrix of the estate of James Doyle, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 3071) to authorize the survey of certain land claimed by the Zuni Pueblo Indians, New Mexico, and the issuance of patent therefor; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 3072) granting a pension to Catherine J. Belden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NYE:

A bill (S. 3073) to amend the act of April 9, 1924, so as to provide for national-park approaches; and

(By request.) A bill (S. 3074) providing for the lease of oil and gas deposits in or under railroad and other rights of way; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 3075) providing for the examination and survey of Wolf River, which empties into the Mississippi River just north of the city of Memphis, and also of Nonconnah River, which empties into the Mississippi River just south of the city of Memphis; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6344) to amend title 28, section 192, United States Code, in respect to the terms of court in the western judicial district of Virginia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPORTATION OF SILVER

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending tariff bill providing for a tariff of 30 cents an ounce on the importation of silver. I ask to have it printed and lie on the table. I also desire in the same connection to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared in regard to the matter, which is in the nature of a report. I ask also that in addition to being printed in the RECORD it may be printed with the proposed amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request as stated is granted.

The amendment and statement referred to are as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN to the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, viz: On page 116, line 2, insert the following:

" PAR. 394½. Silver-bearing ores and mattes of all kinds, 30 cents per ounce on the silver contained therein: *Provided*, That on all importations of silver-bearing ores and mattes of all kinds the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores or mattes by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores or mattes at such establishments they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper

assay of the sample and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entries shall be liquidated thereon. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph.

" PAR. —. Silver bullion or base bullion, silver dross, reclaimed silver, scrap silver, all alloys or combinations of silver not specially provided for, 30 cents per ounce on the silver contained therein.

" PAR. —. Silver-bearing ores, mattes, base bullion, silver dross, reclaimed silver, scrap silver, and all alloys or combinations of silver imported into the United States for the purpose of processing or refining for export to a foreign country and not for use, sale, or disposition within the United States or any of its possessions, may be imported for such purpose free of duty upon the execution of a bond given in double the amount of the estimated duties that would be charged upon such silver contents so imported if for use, sale, or disposition in the United States, conditioned that such silver contents will not be used, sold, or otherwise disposed of in the United States prior to export therefrom, and upon further compliance with such regulations and guaranties as the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations require."

STATEMENT ON SILVER SITUATION BY SENATOR KEY PITTMAN

The critical situation in regard to silver is being discussed in the press of the world. According to the Director of the United States Mint the price of silver is now the lowest in history and the silver dollar is only worth 35 cents. The Spanish peseta is down to about 50 per cent of its par value. In Mexico, South America, and India do we find the same situation with regard to silver money.

In China, where silver is used almost exclusively as a circulating medium, the unprecedented drop in the price of silver has resulted in a proportionate increase in commodity prices and a crisis has been reached. According to editorials of the New York Times and financial papers it is alleged that this situation is caused by an oversupply of silver due to the demonetization of silver and the establishment of gold standards in various countries.

This is undoubtedly true. It is not true, however, that there is an overproduction of silver in the sense of new production. Whilst the supply of silver in the world for market purposes has increased by the cessation of its use as a money medium, the production from mines of new silver has for years and is now steadily decreasing. The production of silver in the United States has decreased from 73,000,000 ounces in 1923 to 59,000,000 ounces in 1929. During the last two years the production of silver in Colorado, Arizona, and Nevada, where the great silver mines of the United States are situated, has decreased from 20 to 25 per cent.

The question is one of international concern. It is one of grave concern in the United States during this period of increasing idleness of labor. Silver mines throughout the West are steadily closing down and thousands of men are being added to the horde of unemployed. Farming communities and towns that have been dependent upon such employment are becoming bankrupt.

Is there any remedy for this condition in the United States? It is the duty of our Government to solve this question at once. There are several hundred producing silver mines in the United States and their existence is being threatened. There is one remedy that would certainly free the United States to a great extent from such panic; that is, an embargo upon the importation of silver, except for the purpose of reduction, refining, and export. This is a drastic measure and the Government may hesitate to undertake it, but the conditions seem to require drastic measures. This country has adopted the embargo before. During the war it placed an embargo upon the exportation of both gold and silver.

Silver, heretofore used as money throughout the world, by reason of a change to a gold standard is being dumped upon the market of the world. It is destructive of the monetary systems of those countries that still use silver chiefly as money and is not founded in international monetary science or in a just regard for world conditions. This silver is also being dumped in the United States to the destruction of our silver-mining industry.

This condition, as far as the United States is concerned, can be alleviated by a tariff duty on the importation of silver. Under normal conditions such a tariff is justified and under the present conditions it is obligatory. This country consumes annually 40,000,000 ounces of silver, while its production is approximately 59,000,000 ounces. There is imported, duty free, from Mexico and South America, a hundred million ounces annually to compete with American-produced silver for the American consumptive market of 40,000,000 ounces.

The average wage in the silver mines of the United States for miners is \$5 a day for eight hours. The wage for the same labor in Mexico and South America is approximately \$1.50 a day. The average increase of all commodity prices in the United States since 1913 is approximately 35 per cent, while the wholesale price of pure silver has decreased over 29 per cent.

I have pending a proposed amendment to the tariff bill providing a duty of 30 cents an ounce upon the importation of silver. If this

amendment is adopted then the dumping of foreign silver into the United States will be retarded and the producers of American silver will be allowed to compete in the United States market upon a living basis.

DUTY ON HIDES

Mr. ODDIE. I submit an amendment to the pending tariff bill providing for a duty on hides, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table. It is an amendment to my former amendment on this item in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

POLITICAL SITUATION IN ALABAMA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief letter from three of the members of the State Democratic executive committee of my State concerning the recent action of the committee and another brief letter from one of the members of the committee to a candidate for the United States Senate, together with some brief comments from myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letters and matters referred to are as follows:

[From the Jasper Advertiser, December 25, 1929]

To the Democrats of the Tenth Congressional District:

The Democratic State executive committee on December 16, 1929, adopted a resolution calling a primary election to be held on the second Tuesday in August, 1930. The resolution contained a provision under which a Democrat who openly and publicly opposed the election of Smith as President last November can not have his name printed upon the primary ballot as a candidate for any State, district, Federal, or circuit office. This restriction was not made against county candidates.

We were elected to the State committee by the Democrats of the tenth congressional district, and we want them to know that we voted against the resolution.

We felt that we were representing the Democrats as a whole, and not any particular candidates, exclusive clique, or partisan faction.

We felt that the conscientious differences of last year should be ignored; that there should not be discrimination against any lifelong Democrat, but they should all be treated alike.

We also felt that if Democrats whose consciences would not let them vote for Smith are allowed to have their names on the ballots as candidates for county offices, the same kind of Democrats should be allowed to have their names printed as candidates for State and district offices.

All Democrats were invited to go into the primary as voters. We thought that in addition to that all Democrats should be given an opportunity to have their names printed upon the ballots so that all voters should vote their choice. The State committee's action was more unfair to the voters than to the candidates.

You may not agree with us, but you elected us, and you are entitled to know the stand we took.

ARTHUR FITE.
HORACE P. GIBSON.
W. S. CHILDERS.

Mr. HEFLIN. The tenth district is the one represented by Congressman BANKHEAD.

The Democratic executive committee of Jefferson County, the county in which Birmingham is located, and by far the largest county in population and voting strength in the State, by a vote of 44 to 24 repudiated the action of the 27 members of the State committee and requested the committee to meet and change its action.

Mr. Fite's letter to Mr. Bankhead:

JASPER, ALA., December 21, 1929.

Mr. J. H. BANKHEAD,

American Traders Bank Building, Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. BANKHEAD: The sentiment among Democrats here appears to be practically unanimous that the action of the State committee in prohibiting the names of the Democrats who openly opposed Governor Smith's election being printed on the Democratic primary ballots was unwise and detrimental to the Democratic Party in this State.

Are you willing to join in a request that the State committee rescind its action and remove the restriction that was intended to keep the names of Senator HEFLIN and Judge Locke off the ballots?

If the committee refuses to comply with such request, do you favor the voters in the primary being given an opportunity to write or stamp the names of HEFLIN and Locke on the ballots and vote for them, if they want to do so?

If the voters should write or stamp the names of HEFLIN and Locke on the ballots and vote for them, do you favor HEFLIN being declared the Democratic nominee for Senator, if he should get more votes in the primary than any other candidate; and would you, in that event, refuse to allow your name certified as the nominee?

I think the interest of the Democratic Party is paramount, and it is my desire to see the matter settled amicably and without regard to the legality of the committee's action.

I intend to give publication to this letter and would like to have permission to publish your reply.

Please let me hear from you before Friday, December 27.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR FITE.

Mr. Bankhead declined to join Mr. Fite and other Democrats in requesting the State committee to rescind its action, and he also declined to agree that the Democratic voters of the State shall be permitted to write or stamp my name as a candidate for the Senate on the ticket to be voted in the primary next August.

SAFETY IN COMMERCIAL AVIATION

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I send forward an editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 4, 1930, which has to do with certain phases of commercial aviation. I ask permission to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Saturday, January 4, 1930]

AIR SAFETY: WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

The most precious achievement of American commercial aviation—its record of almost unparalleled safety—is to-day being jeopardized by the mystery and uncertainty which are permitted to surround every aircraft accident of major importance. The collision this week of two motion-picture airplanes adds itself to the five recent tragedies of the air which still stand out in public thought, blemishing the good name of aeronautics and undermining public confidence in the airplane as a secure and practical means of travel. The facts concerning these mishaps—facts which would do much to dissipate the unfounded fears which enforced ignorance invariably arouses—are known to very few, even on the inside of the industry, if indeed to any. The public is kept in the dark.

The result of the situation is that the most unfavorable construction and the most damaging publicity accompanies every crash, and because the true explanation is not forthcoming from a responsible source there is no opportunity to place the responsibility and to correct misapprehensions. Consequently public opinion must rest its judgment upon vagaries and hearsay.

The corrective is obviously accurate information, made available as promptly as possible by an authoritative board of investigation, much in the same manner as railroad and maritime accidents are officially investigated and their causes reported. It is matter of public welfare that such inquiries should be made in the field of aeronautics. They would, we believe, be welcomed by the industry itself, because aviation has far more to fear from rumors and ignorance than it can ever have from disinterested truth.

It is essential that these investigations should be made by a body which has both the authority and the competence to conduct its inquiries. What body is better equipped to perform this task than the division of aeronautics of the Department of Commerce, which already makes an examination into all aerial mishaps and whose facilities for this work are well developed? The hitch in the present arrangement is that their reports on specific accidents and specific causes are not made public. Every available source of information should be open to its examiners. They should undoubtedly be invested with authority to subpoena witnesses, and their findings should be made public as quickly as thorough investigation will permit.

The six airplane tragedies of recent months and the obscurity and doubt which has shrouded them give some indication of the necessity for these investigations:

1. On March 17 a tri-motored passenger plane was wrecked at Newark, resulting in 14 fatalities. The pilot, arrested and charged with manslaughter, was later freed. Conflicting rumors were rife, running between the extremes of the plane being too heavily laden to the pilot simply having used poor judgment.

What are the facts?

2. On July 1 a trans-Atlantic pilot crashed at Westbury, Long Island, with three fatalities. Rumors and divergent opinions again dominated the accounts of the mishap. A district attorney charged the pilot with intoxication, but this evidence was not presented at the coroner's inquest, and the whole thing petered out, with justice to no one.

What are the facts?

3. On September 3 an air passenger liner fell near the Arizona-New Mexico line, with eight fatalities. Lost on the 3d, it was finally discovered on the 9th. Conflicting reasons as to the causes were issued from various sources even before the plane was found. At least three investigations were started, but no adequate explanation ever reached the general public.

What are the facts?

4. On November 20 an airplane dropped onto the roof of a New York skyscraper. There were two fatalities, and the one man who escaped claimed that he saved himself by jumping with a parachute. Statements from others who were present at the scene indicated a different story. It was claimed, for example, that the two men who hired the plane had deliberately planned a parachute jump into Central Park, and that the plane was thrown off balance by an unexpected leap.

What are the facts?

5. On November 27 a 4-motored 30-passenger transport plane damaged the roofs of several houses and crashed into the side of another near Roosevelt Field, Long Island. The event itself received blazing publicity, but the causes were largely ignored. It was reported that one motor was missing at the take-off and that another motor on the same side of the wing later went bad. It was also claimed that the pilot, the plane nearing an open field, could have maneuvered a landing with all the motors stopped.

What are the facts?

6. On January 2 two motion-picture airplanes collided head-on over the Pacific Ocean near Santa Monica, Calif., causing 10 fatalities. Of all the late mishaps, this seems most obviously to be the result of hazardous, if not reckless, flying, and therefore is the least significant in the perspective of commercial safety. Yet even this conclusion is not established. It is guessed that the sun might have bothered the pilots. It is guessed this and it is guessed something else!

What are the facts?

In no instance have they been adequately forthcoming.

The public and the aviation industry alike need a responsible answer to the question. What are the facts? If aeronautical science is to profit at all by these sad experiences; if corrective measures are to be speedily developed; if public opinion is to have confidence in the airplane as a common carrier, the facts should be known.

We believe that aviation will lend its support and its cooperation to any reliable official body charged with the responsibility of investigation and report. Such investigation would, before long, give public opinion the same faith in the airplane that it now has in the subway, the railroad, and the steamship.

WOODROW WILSON

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on Woodrow Wilson, delivered by Dr. Charles Kingsley Webster, of Washington, D. C., on last Sunday, the tenth anniversary of the League of Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Dr. Charles Kingsley Webster spoke as follows:

You will not expect me, I know, this afternoon to give you an appreciation of the personality of Woodrow Wilson. It would indeed be impertinent for me to attempt to do so before an audience such as this, which contains many who knew him intimately. I shall try to speak as a student of history and politics; but I shall not try to conceal the fact—I could not if I would—that the personality of Woodrow Wilson has been one of the main intellectual and moral influences of my life. It is perhaps true to say that Woodrow Wilson exercised a greater influence on the youth of Britain than upon that of any other country in the world, especially on those of us who were taking part in the European war. When we began to perceive, as we thought we did, that the ideals for which most of us had entered the war were disappearing as the struggle went on, so that it seemed almost as if it made no difference which side had the victory, it was Woodrow Wilson who recreated the ideals which meant so much to us. At the very crisis of the struggle a voice came over the Atlantic, seeming then, indeed, very far off, yet clear and resonant, which awoke to new life all those liberal elements in Europe which wanted a particular kind of world peace, gave a new morale, a new idealism to the allied forces, and, indeed, exercised as great an influence on the issue of the struggle as the 2,000,000 American soldiers who eventually came to take part in it.

There is now a vast mass of material available about Woodrow Wilson—the records of fervent disciples, the accounts of colleagues great and small, some of them more anxious to reveal their own part in events than to appreciate his, the bitter railings of his enemies, and the sorrowful criticisms of those who did not obtain from him all that they had hoped and expected. But there is little evidence that Woodrow Wilson himself cared very much about what our generation thought about him. He was an historian, and he was prepared to leave to history the justification of his life and ideas. We can not conceive him publishing any apologia of his life, such as Bismarck did in his old age. If he had lived and written, as he meant to do, it would have been rather with his ideas than his own actions that he was concerned. But as the years go by and we are further removed from the great struggle in which he took part, he stands out more and more above the other statesmen as the greatest figure of all those men who were subjected to the greatest test of modern history.

Lord Acton has said, "Great men are always bad men," and by great men he meant great men of action. Yet there is now in all countries a recognition of the fact that Woodrow Wilson was not only a great man but a good man. The reason why his policy has prevailed is because it

was founded upon principle. It was another great American statesman, perhaps the greatest American diplomatist who ever lived, John Quincy Adams, who said, "The more of pure moral principle is carried into the policy of a government, the wiser and more profound will that policy be." It is because Woodrow Wilson founded his work upon moral principle that it has continued to live.

Before I go on to the main subject of our meeting—the League of Nations—I want to say a word or two about Woodrow Wilson and the peace treaties, because there is often much misunderstanding about the part he played in connection with them. Even his friends have suggested that he made a bargain over the treaties so that he might obtain the League of Nations from European statesmen. That is an entire misconception. Woodrow Wilson made no bargain for the league. He had secured the League of Nations as an integral part of the peace settlement before the rest of the treaties were written. When the statesmen first met at Paris to consider their program, the French produced a list of subjects in which the League of Nations was one of half a hundred others, and a long way down the list. Neither Lloyd George nor President Wilson would accept such a program, and they were asked what they wanted to put first. Lloyd George said that he put first reparations and the punishment of the guilty; Woodrow Wilson put the League of Nations first, with the result that by February 14 he was able to present the first draft of the covenant and get it accepted by a plenary conference of all the nations assembled in Paris. The later alterations were largely directed to secure the acceptance of his own countrymen rather than the acceptance of the nations of Europe.

But once the league was accepted, on the rest of the peace Woodrow Wilson had of course to accept compromises, and it is true that the result has been deplored by people in all countries. But what Woodrow Wilson tried to do was to secure that the permanent things should be as good as possible and that the worst things should be as temporary as possible. How far has the last 10 years justified him?

Well, in the first place, the economic provisions of the treaties against which the most crushing criticism was leveled 10 years ago have now almost completely disappeared. The settlement which is now being reached is more or less along the lines which most independent thinkers thought just 10 years ago.

And though, of course, the territorial decisions have been more permanent, yet Wilson managed to secure, in conjunction with Britain, that the most important of them all was settled in the right way. There was an enormous danger that a new Alsace-Lorraine would be erected between France and Germany. Wilson prevented that; and no one would have rejoiced more than he to know that Germany as well as France has now accepted the frontier between the two countries, and that it has been secured and negotiated by a treaty, the efficacy of which depends upon the League of Nations itself. "The towers of Strasbourg," once said Lord Acton, "dominate the landscape of Europe." They now no longer dominate the landscape of Europe.

In other parts of Europe, of course, the frontiers were not so successfully drawn. Blots still remain. But it is difficult to see how any better frontiers could have been made at that time. As it was a hundred million minorities were reduced to thirty, most of which were inevitable minorities, and for most of them the League of Nations is gradually building up a system of protection through the agency of the minority treaties.

Nor is it true, as has often been said in this country, that Wilson sacrificed American interests in order to obtain the League of Nations. What were the American interests in 1919? In the first place, there was the financial interest. I do not know how far Woodrow Wilson himself would have insisted as much as has been done upon those rights, but at any rate at Paris, in spite of every blandishment and every form of pressure, he retained them intact, and no one can deny but that he represented in doing that the vast majority of his countrymen.

Secondly, America desired to have parity in naval armament with the greatest naval power. That parity had practically already been secured by the measures which Woodrow Wilson had taken before the war came to an end.

Thirdly, above all, Woodrow Wilson believed that world peace was the greatest of America's interests. It was for that reason that he laid the foundations of the League of Nations.

The idea of a League of Nations was not, of course, invented by Woodrow Wilson. It had arisen in many countries; it was accepted by men of many different politics. For example, let me quote to you one of the most notable utterances made in this country before America came into the war: "I know how quickly we shall be met with the statement that this is a dangerous question—that no nation can submit to the judgment of other nations—and we must be careful at the beginning not to attempt too much. I know the difficulties which arise when we speak of anything which seems to involve an alliance. But I do not believe that when Washington warned us against entangling alliances he meant for one moment that we should not join with other civilized nations of the world if a method could be found to diminish war and encourage peace."

That sentiment was not spoken by Woodrow Wilson. It was spoken by Senator Lodge in this city of Washington, on Saturday, May 27,

1916, at the first annual meeting of the League to Enforce Peace. But, though other men in other countries had the idea, it was Woodrow Wilson's passionate advocacy that made the idea possible. No one else with the same conviction had the power; no one else with the power had the same conviction.

In 1919 the destinies of the world were in the hands of three men—Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Woodrow Wilson (it is interesting to note that not one of them was an Englishman)—all men of rare gifts and great moral courage, to whom the democracies of three countries had intrusted extraordinary powers in the course of the great struggle. How different was their attitude toward the great problems that confronted them! Clemenceau lived in the past. For him history had ended in 1871. Lloyd George has always lived in the present. He had to think of the last election and the next. Wilson lived in the future.

Thus, while neither Lloyd George nor Clemenceau opposed the League of Nations, it was not for them the supreme necessity of mankind. It was left to Woodrow Wilson to gather around himself the liberal forces of France and Britain, the aspirations of the small powers and the neutrals, the immense longings of the peoples in all countries, and to bring out of the chaotic world, which had almost disintegrated before their eyes, a new order which will mark an epoch in the history of mankind. That is the reason why the name of Woodrow Wilson will always be associated with the League of Nations in a way the name of no other man is associated with any of the great charters of the liberties of mankind.

How far has the last 10 years justified him?

In the first place, the League of Nations has lived. Woodrow Wilson said on February 14, 1919, when he brought the covenant of the league before the statesmen at Paris, "A living thing is born." It was a bold challenge. Not many there believed him. It came indeed into a world in which it seemed almost impossible that it should live. America not only withdrew from the league but for some short time was actively hostile to it. Lloyd George never attended a meeting of the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations, and put far more trust in a body that was then called the "Supreme Council." France relied far more upon her armies in the Rhineland than upon the League of Nations. Germany, rebuffed, turned away from the league which it found powerless to protect it, and when I visited the Ruhr in 1923 I found that German workmen almost spat when the League of Nations was mentioned, in order to take the taste of it out of their mouth. Nevertheless the league lived, and it might say like Talleyrand, who, when asked what he did during the period of the Terror, answered "j'ai vécu"—"I succeeded in living." Indeed the infant Hercules even strangled some of the serpents that surrounded its cradle, and gained strength in the process, and it has grown from year to year, creating new things and attempting new tasks, so that men have gradually learned to do things that they never did before, and found out new things to do that they never dreamed of doing.

This is the great justification of Woodrow Wilson. If he had not lived, we should still be arguing whether a form of world organization was possible; professors would have been writing articles about it, and parliaments would have been debating it. As it is we have had a great laboratory where plans could be made by the men who alone could insure their trial. We have learned more about international cooperation in the last 10 years than all the prophets, professors, and publicists had told us in the 400 years of modern history that preceded it.

Secondly, the League of Nations has made possible a new kind of friendship and understanding among the statesmen of a large portion of the world. Woodrow Wilson told us at Manchester on December 30, 1918, "Friendship must have machinery * * * that makes it necessary to make some great effort to have with one another an easy and constant method of conference, so that troubles may be taken when they are little and not allowed to grow until they are big." How far has the League of Nations succeeded in carrying out that idea? Well, I hardly need to tell you. It has become a commonplace that a new era has arisen in the relations between statesmen. Since 1919 the council has held 57 sessions and the assembly of the league has met 11 times.

The foreign ministers of Britain, France, and Germany are constantly meeting one another around the council table, and there come together with them the foreign ministers of almost every European State and many from other quarters of the globe. It is impossible to overestimate the effect of this constant intercourse on the minds of the statesmen. It enables them to understand their common problems in a way no other device could make possible. In 1914 Sir Edward Grey had been only once on the Continent of Europe. When he exchanged those fateful telegrams with the foreign ministers of the other great European States he hardly knew anything of the men who would receive them and how their minds would act. The new device has transformed the relations of the European powers and made possible things that would not have been dreamt of in 1919.

Let us admit, however, that it has not yet been possible to apply this mechanism fully to the whole world. In 1928, when the surface relations between Britain and the United States were not quite so

good as they are to-day, Mr. Baldwin spoke to the House of Commons as follows:

"In Europe all her statesmen have got into the habit of meeting at Geneva and talking together, by which they learn not only each others' point of view but, what is very important, each others' idiosyncrasies as individuals, and I think there is rapidly coming into European statesmanship * * * a desire in negotiations to see the other point of view and to compromise if something can be effected by that compromise, far more than existed before the war. American statesmen do not know European statesmen; European statesmen do not know American statesmen. There is no personal intercourse, and the only intercourse that takes place is the written dispatch that goes across 3,000 miles of ocean. It is a far more difficult thing to get a mutual understanding in these circumstances."

May we not rejoice that since those words were spoken, measures have been taken to close the gap between Europe and America, and is it too much to hope that it will soon become a normal part of international relations that the most responsible American statesmen will constantly meet their colleagues in other parts of the world?

Thirdly, the League has inaugurated a new system of public diplomacy. This was, of course, a point on which Woodrow Wilson often insisted. It is an entirely new thing. In the nineteenth century it was a commonplace that diplomacy was founded on secret treaties and secret discussions. The peoples were bound by conventions of whose terms they were almost entirely unaware, and it was considered impossible that the most intimate problems which affected the pride and prestige of nations should be openly discussed in a public forum.

Now, as regards secret treaties, the provisions in the covenant have so completely destroyed them that the journalists have been driven in despair to fabricate them. It has become simply impossible for statesmen to rely on them. The old era of Bismarckian diplomacy has in that sense passed away forever. As regards the public discussion of vital international relations, this was, of course, more difficult to establish. It was done first in the assembly of the League of Nations, and it is one of the reasons why the assembly of the league has established its tremendously important position in the whole fabric of international relations. That victory was largely won by the persistent advocacy and example of Lord Cecil. It was gradually applied by the council, which, though of course it also meets in secret yet constantly meets in public for the discussion of vital international questions. The scene at Geneva has now become one which the world regards as normal, with the foreign ministers of the great European powers, with representatives of Europe, Asia, and America beside them, discussing openly the most difficult of international problems in which the vital interests and prestige of their nations are involved, often without knowing what the results of their conversations will be. Before them are the representatives of the press of the world, and as they talk messenger boys run out of the room carrying their words to the wires by which they are flashed to all countries in the world. By this means you have got the beginnings of a new technique among the statesmen of the world, and above all you have got a means not only for the education of the statesmen but, what is just as necessary, for the education of the peoples upon whose will ultimately the actions of the statesmen depend. This is an invention just as marvelous and as little expected as the invention of the airplane and the radio.

Fourthly, nothing was more persistent in Wilson's advocacy of the league than the rights of the small nations. In the nineteenth century the small powers had no influence upon international affairs. They were never consulted unless indeed occasionally when they were the victims of some great power. In one sense the Great War was fought for their rights. It saw the end of four empires, while the greatest of them all was so transformed as to be an entirely new political conception at the end of it. Yet at the end of the World War the world lay in the grasp of the great powers. Not a ship could sail the sea, hardly a ton of food be moved without their consent. Their armies and financial and economic resources made them masters of the world as never before. How were the small states to find their place in the new order? Woodrow Wilson's first plan put the states of the world upon an equality.

It was from General Smuts that the idea came of a council of great powers, but when the small powers insisted on representation upon it Wilson gladly accepted their conditions and on the council of the league nine places are now reserved for the representatives of the smaller powers. They have played an important part in the work of that body, and had a far greater influence upon international affairs than they ever possessed in the nineteenth century. You will recall that in 1926 Professor Unden, the representative of Sweden, was able to obtain his own way against the united pressure of the three great powers of Europe. Moreover, in the assembly the small powers are able to criticize as they like the actions of the great.

Some of the small nations also were in a grievous state as a result of the Great War. They needed assistance badly and yet they wished to preserve their independence. Through the action of the league, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Greece have been able to receive finan-

cial and economic help and yet not surrender one jot or tittle of their independence.

Some small nations have received recognition which they could never have obtained unless the League of Nations had been in existence. At the crisis of affairs in Paris, Woodrow Wilson received from Washington the message: "A word for Ireland would help." He must have been extraordinarily tempted to say that word, to make some gesture which could be used for political ends, but he did not do so. He did not do so because he was convinced that any action at that time would do the cause of Ireland more harm than good. Yet in four years the Irish Free State was in existence and its independence was guaranteed by its participation in the structure of the League of Nations itself. Woodrow Wilson was right when he trusted to the action of the league to prepare the way for the freedom of Ireland. Though England had then unexampled resources, the soldiers that broke the Hindenburg line, vast masses of airplanes, tanks, and armored cars, she could not crush Ireland, because her will was paralyzed by the new principles which Woodrow Wilson had made effective. Moreover, the strategic difficulties which had complicated the Irish question were much lessened by the mere existence of the League of Nations. Thus the Irish Free State has been able to take its place among the other nations of the world. She has played a most interesting and very intelligent part at Geneva. Naturally she has quite often been on a different side from Britain but she has learned there to cooperate not only with the other nations of the British Commonwealth, but with all the other nations members of the league, and has played an important part in the keeping of world peace, so that we may say in one sense that Woodrow Wilson was one of the founders of Ireland's freedom.

And the league has brought freedom to oppressed peoples of every kind, even those who could never speak for themselves. I need hardly remind you of the great work which is being done for native races through the agency of the League of Nations. We often forget that there are still millions of slaves in the world, but, at any rate, hundreds of thousands have been freed through the agency of the slavery convention drawn up at Geneva two years ago, to which the United States has, as you know, gladly subscribed.

To tell you of the many other activities of the league for the welfare of mankind would take far more time than I have at my disposal, but let me turn now in these last few minutes to consideration of the question as to how far the League of Nations is suitably designed as an instrument for the prevention of war. Let us begin by asking ourselves what exactly we mean by the prevention of war.

The idea of preventing war is not a new one. In Europe in the last quarter of the nineteenth century there were no wars, except in the Balkans, and on the whole the statesmen were anxious for peace and desirous of avoiding war. They had their instruments. They believed in alliances and big armaments as preventives of war, strange as it may seem to us now; while others, outside the ring of statesmen, used to preach that brotherhood was the sole means to prevent war; while others, again, said that the economic connections between the nations, the connections of capital and the connections of labor, were now so strong that they would prevent war. Well, we know now that all those instruments were futile. So far from alliances and big armaments preventing war, we know now that they are instruments for and bound to produce war. Alliances produce counteralliances, and big armaments produce fear, both of which produce war. Nor is brotherhood by itself likely to stop war unless the world changes much more quickly than it has done in the last 2,000 years; while the crisis of 1914 showed that ties between international capital and international labor, which were thought so strong, were just about as powerful as cobwebs across the mouth of a cannon.

Surely the reason for the failure of all these things was that they did not go to the root of the question. If we want to prevent war, we must set up somewhere something to do in the future what war has done in the past. And war in the past has been the great decider between the nations, deciding brutally, badly, often creating as many problems as it solved, but still for the moment making the great decision and enforcing it. It was war, for example, that decided that the British flag should fly over Canada and India and that the American flag should fly over Texas and California, and if we are to abolish war we must have somewhere an agency that can make decisions as big as those. I don't pretend to say that the League of Nations has yet successfully solved that great problem. But at least in the last 10 years we have learned more about the method of solution than at any other period of the world's history.

In the first place the covenant itself, by the obligations it imposes upon the States who signed it, has put tremendous barriers in the way of war, barriers of publicity, and delay, and it has created new means for the settlement of the great decisions. It has, for example, brought into existence the Permanent Court of International Justice, which is now recognized by the peoples of the whole world, with the exception of a small minority, as a body in which they can place full trust and confidence for the settlement of legal disputes between the nations. At the last assembly the Prime Minister of Britain announced that Britain and all the dominions were prepared to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the court for all legal disputes. Their example was followed by

many other States, so that now all the great powers of Europe and more than half the membership of the League of Nations have agreed to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the court for all legal disputes between them.

The covenant does not pretend to make the final settlements. It is, however, always concerned with the peace of the world. By article 11, Wilson's favorite article, every State which has signed the covenant has the friendly right of interfering between any other two members that are disputants, a right which does not exist by international law apart from the covenant of the League of Nations, so that the council has the supreme duty of continually watching over the peace of the world. It has not, however, tried to arrogate to itself the right to decide unless the disputants wish it to, and in the last 10 years more and more the tendency has been for the council to watch over the peace of world, while the decisions are made by other bodies. There are, for example, large numbers of treaties that have been signed between nations which provide for the settlement of disputes of all kinds, and the League of Nations has itself drawn up a general act for the settlement of such disputes, which is now under the consideration of the great powers of Europe. There have been other treaties on this side of the world for the American powers.

We may say, therefore, that on the question of decisions tremendous progress has been made, but how about enforcing these decisions? Here I touch upon the most controversial question of international politics. There are some people who say that the idea of force must be entirely removed from any plan for international peace. There are others who think that any such plan is useless unless there are great armies and navies to enforce the peace of the world.

Woodrow Wilson agreed with those who placed moral force first. It is the foundation upon which human society must rest. He said on December 4, 1918, at the Sorbonne, "My conception of the League of Nations is just this, that it shall operate as the organized moral force of men throughout the world." We have all rejoiced in the Kellogg pact. It has shown how great that moral force is, and no one would have rejoiced in it more than Woodrow Wilson. He would have rejoiced also in the manner in which it was made, at the care which was taken that it should conflict in no way with the promises which states have taken under the covenant of the League of Nations itself. But is it enough? The armies and navies and the air fleets which exist give the answer. If the moral force of the world is to prevail, it must have a means by which it can be organized, as Woodrow Wilson said. Once it is organized, then the amount of armed force which it will be necessary to place at its disposal will be such that no armed force can challenge the moral force. It is surely in some such way that the great problem of organized world peace will be solved, and the way to it was clearly pointed by Woodrow Wilson, although it was impossible for him to work out all the machinery necessary in the short time in which the covenant of the League of Nations was made.

Ultimately, of course, the success of any such plan depends on the fact that the organization should be a world one. Woodrow Wilson could never think except in terms of a world organization. It was difficult for him to think of the continents as separated when 2,000,000 American soldiers stood on European soil together with hundreds of thousands of others from Asia, Africa, and Australasia. "America," he said, "is not interested in the peace of Europe but in the peace of the world." How far has the League of Nations carried out that idea?

It is sometimes talked about as though it was purely an European agency. Well, you have only to look on the map on the wall [pointing to a map of the world on which all the states, members of the League of Nations, were represented] to see how world-wide it is—every state of Europe up to the Russian frontier, four-fifths of Asia, most of South and Central America, and all Australasia, and one state of the North American Continent! Yet it must be admitted that the league has not functioned in other parts of the world so easily as it has functioned in Europe.

The absence of Russia and the United States has made it less world-wide than Woodrow Wilson meant it to be, and has therefore complicated many of its problems. Yet we may rejoice that more and more the United States has found it possible to cooperate with the league in some of the greatest problems that affect humanity, and at Geneva itself, as Europe grows more and more pacified, attention is now being directed out in the world. At the last assembly, for example, a great portion of the speech of the British Prime Minister was devoted to extra-European problems; and no speech aroused greater attention than that of the Chinese representative who brought before the assembly the question of article 19 in connection with China's "unequal treaties."

Are not those of us right who assure the world that in her own time and in her own way the United States will find a solution for all the problems that now divide us? Woodrow Wilson himself was at any rate confident in his dying days that America would do so. We may believe it because the principles which he gave to the world were above all American. One of Woodrow Wilson's greatest speeches was made before the World War took place, in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, on July 4, 1914, when he analyzed the Declaration of Independence and showed that it was above all a practical document for putting into

force by human bodies great principles; and then, perhaps with that intuitive foreboding that great men sometimes have, he went on to speak as follows: "My dream is that as the years go on and the world knows more and more about America it will also drink at those fountains of youth and renewal; that it also will turn to America for those moral inspirations which lie at the basis of all freedom. * * * I do not know that there will ever be a declaration of independence and of grievances for mankind, but I believe that if any such document is ever drawn, it will be drawn in the spirit of the American Declaration of Independence and that America has lifted high the light which will shine unto all generations and guide the feet of mankind to the goal of justice and liberty and peace."

Woodrow Wilson was able to found the League of Nations not only because he was a great man and a good man, but because he was a great American.

"WHAT SUBSTITUTE FOR PROHIBITION?"

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by former Senator William Cabell Bruce entitled "What Substitute for Prohibition?"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

WHAT SUBSTITUTE FOR PROHIBITION?

By William Cabell Bruce, former United States Senator from Maryland

The time has come in the progress of the antiprohibition movement in this country when it is of vital importance to the success of that movement that it should set before it a single, specific plan of remedial procedure. Its ability to do this has unquestionably been most effectively facilitated by the temperance plans and comments elicited by the Hearst temperance contest. Not only do most of the papers and letters contributed to that contest reflect in a highly interesting and instructive manner the varied reactions of public sentiment in the United States to the practical workings of prohibition but many of them collectively constitute an invaluable basis of comparison for the consideration of the relative merits of the leading suggestions made by thoughtful individuals for bringing the scandals and abuses of prohibition to an end. Roughly speaking, these suggestions may be reduced to three classes—those which contemplate the entire repeal of the eighteenth amendment; those which contemplate merely the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law; and those which contemplate the amendment in one form or another of the eighteenth amendment.

The idea that the aim of the present agitation against prohibition should be the repeal in its entirety of the eighteenth amendment is an ill-advised one. Inflexibly hostile to prohibition as one might be, he might well withhold assent from such an idea except as a last resort, or, in other words, only because he believed that the use of drink licensed by law, however, ineffectually regulated, can never be as productive of social demoralization, general lawlessness, political corruption, and bloodshed as the use of drink unconditionally banned by law. There is more moral ruin in a spoonful of outlawed than in a glass of licensed liquor. Since the adoption of the eighteenth amendment the regulation of intoxicating beverages has in not a few highly civilized communities outside the United States been subjected to wise and salutary innovations which have produced a wealth of enlightening experience from which our own land might well profit. Indeed, since that time in few fields of social reform has a more marked advance been made than in the field of drink reform, always excepting the United States and Finland, practically the only two countries in the world where prohibition still prevails, and they, because of the tragic step that each took in an hour of honest but overwrought enthusiasm, are unable just now to share in the beneficent results of this advance. Only less firmly opposed than the prohibitionist himself, therefore, should any honest and judicious foe of prohibition be to taking any risk that might attend the return of the United States to preprohibition conditions. If there has been any moral gain of any kind for temperance in prohibition, however small, let us by all means hold fast to it, even when making a revolutionary change in absolute prohibition itself.

Even if these views were not correct in point of principle, yet merely as a matter of tactical expediency, such an arduous, short-sighted program as that of attempting to repeal the eighteenth amendment in its entirety, so long as there was any other sound alternative program, can not be too earnestly deprecated. Whatever may be the merits as an original or abstract proposition of the contention that drink should be a matter of State rather than of national regulation, the fact is that through the operation of an irresistible train of events the Federal Government has actually assumed complete control of the liquor traffic, as it might well have done in the beginning had the framers of the Federal Constitution, taking the view that nothing is more national than the desire to drink or more universal than the morbid sequels which flow from it, conferred upon Congress the power to establish throughout the United States a uniform system of liquor control as well as a uniform rule of naturalization and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies. In going ahead in any circumstances there is nothing like working forward so far as it is possible to do so from a present foothold, for rarely, as has often been observed, do revolutions revolve

backward. Nor should we forget that after all it is no great stride from the general surveillance that the Internal Revenue Department of the Federal Government maintained over intoxicating liquors for excise purposes before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment to the similar surveillance that it might be empowered by a modification of the eighteenth amendment to keep up, in relation to consumption, over the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, and exportation of such liquors.

DANGERS OF REPEAL

Be this as it may, to the average citizen who reaches his conclusions not so much by closely reasoned methods as by hasty processes of chop logic, the bare repeal of the eighteenth amendment simply suggests the return in many States to the old saloon and to all the discredit that attached to it in both a private and a public sense and the renewal in a still larger number of States, considered as a whole, of a crazy-quilt patchwork of regulatory legislation made up of many different patterns, and all the interstate distrust, friction, and collision that such a confused situation would certainly revive.

Equally objectionable is the idea that the scope of the present anti-prohibition movement should be limited to the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law. To be sure, Gen. Lincoln C. Andrews, the former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, justly thought that a change in the Volstead Act, which would allow the use of a beer strong enough to impart a real, albeit moderate, stimulus to the nervous system of a normal human being, though not strong enough to violate the provisions of the eighteenth amendment, would sensibly diminish the difficulties of prohibition enforcement; but further than this it is hard to see any profit to be derived from the modification of the national prohibition law, or any advantage to be acquired from the total repeal of that law, except, of course, that some of the States might then similarly decide to allow the use of a beer of the same nature. That neither the modification nor the repeal of the national prohibition law could lawfully result in the sanction by either Federal or State authority contrary to the inhibitions of the eighteenth amendment of the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, or exportation of distilled liquors of any sort, with their very high percentages of alcoholic content, is manifest. Almost equally manifest is it that the same thing might be predicted of so-called light wines, for there is nothing that can without an abuse of language be called wine that does not contain at least 7 per cent of alcohol.

DISHONEST PROPOSALS

The trouble about almost all the proposals that look to the repeal or modification of the Volstead Act, to be perfectly frank, is that they are devised, not so much with any purpose of honestly keeping within the limitations of the eighteenth amendment as of baffling or circumventing it. In other words, it can be truthfully said of almost all these proposals that they are suggestive of mere chicanery or sharp practice, and are altogether unworthy of the spirit in which an alteration in the organic law of the land should be approached. With a few exceptions, they assume that either Congress or the State legislatures might be forced or inveigled into nullifying the eighteenth amendment by silence or astute phrasing.

All ignore the fact that if Congress were to repeal the national prohibition law entirely, every State would, as a matter of self-protection against drink abuses, have to revise its former system of drink regulations, so far as inconsistent with the eighteenth amendment, and if it desired such relief as it could lawfully obtain from the restraints of the eighteenth amendment, would have to adjust the revision nicely to the fact that wine, heavy or light, it probably could not legalize at all, and to the further fact that it could not even legalize beer that had an alcoholic content in excess, say, of 2.75 per cent.

One of the few plans that holds out an escape from the tyranny of the eighteenth amendment, through the modification of the national prohibition law, and yet does not merit the harsh strictures which we have passed upon the great mass of the reformatory plans based upon the repeal or modification of that law, is the plan contained in the paper written by Franklin Chase Hoyt, the accomplished presiding justice of the children's court of New York City, which, in competition with many thousands of such papers, won the first prize of \$25,000 in the Hearst temperance contest; and yet this plan, too, would seem to be gravely vulnerable. Justice Hoyt claims that "the eighteenth amendment can not be replaced for many years to come," that "the proposal to permit the States at their option to dispense liquor will never prove acceptable," and that if the Volstead Act "is to be changed, such change must be based squarely and honestly upon sensible definitions and not upon unsatisfactory tinkering with alcoholic percentages." Then after calling attention to the fact that what the eighteenth amendment in express terms prohibits "is not alcoholic beverages" but "intoxicating liquors," he says: "Let Congress repeal the Volstead Act and substitute a law defining the words 'intoxicating liquors' as 'all alcoholic products of distillation.' Let it ban the manufacture, sale, and transportation of such products throughout the country except for commercial and medicinal purposes, but at the same time let it permit each State to regulate and control the manufacture and sale of all malt, brewed, and fermented beverages within its own borders." Justice Hoyt further says: "It is scarcely believable, if Congress should pass a law defining its interpre-

tation of the constitutional amendment as suggested, the Supreme Court would take it upon itself to nullify the will of the representatives of the people. It must be remembered that the ablest court decisions generally recognize and respect the necessity of interpreting the law in accordance with changing social ideas and conditions."

It is to be feared that Justice Hoyt, despite his rare caliber as a prize-winner, is just a little of a *jeune homme ingénu* in politics, unless he is affecting more confidence in this instance than he really feels. Anyhow, he thinks, though the thought would seem somewhat inconsistent with what he has just said about the difficulty of "replacing" the eighteenth amendment, that even if the Supreme Court were to "take it upon itself" to do such a bold thing as to "nullify the will" of Congress, drys, wets, wet-drys, and all—that is to say, to strike down an unconstitutional statute enacted by Congress—the insertion of the word "distilled" before the words "intoxicating liquors" in the eighteenth amendment by another constitutional amendment "would settle the whole question." Apparently one of the reasons why the justice believes that the Supreme Court would be slow to impose upon Congress and the States this comparatively easy task is found in the fact "that distillation is the act of man and has been responsible for practically all the evils which 'liquor' has inflicted upon the human race, while fermentation is the act of nature, and that to many [though hardly to Bishop Cannon and other political parsons, it might be interpolated] must mean in the most reverential sense the act of God." Finally, the justice is so sanguine as to be satisfied that if his plan were adopted the reign of law would be completely reestablished in the prohibition field and "traffic in distilled liquor would eventually come to be regarded as shameful as that in drugs and narcotics."

TINKERINGS AND DEFINITIONS

We disagree with Justice Hoyt in every or almost every particular. The outlook for the "replacement" of the eighteenth amendment is nothing like so gloomy as he would make us believe it to be, except in the event of the refusal of the Supreme Court to exhibit the extraordinary measure of deference for Congress that he anticipates in connection with his own plan. What popular agitation has done, popular agitation can undo. An opening, big enough to let the prohibition cat in, is big enough to let him out. In our opinion, too, "tinkerings with alcoholic percentages," however "unsatisfactory," and not "sensible definitions" are the only agencies that could ever be made to squeeze anything worth mentioning out of the Volstead Act for the benefit of the antiprohibition cause. Nor, when it is remembered that spirits are being sold from Government storehouses in Canada, a country not unlike our own, is it easy to understand why "the proposal to permit the States at their option to dispense liquor" could "never prove acceptable" in the United States.

We do not believe that a change in the Volstead Act, defining the words "intoxicating liquors" in the eighteenth amendment as equivalent to "all alcoholic products of distillation," would escape the searching spear of the Supreme Court Ithuriel. In entertaining the contrary opinion, Justice Hoyt is doubtless influenced by the decisions of that court in the cases of *Hollender v. Magone*, 149 U. S., 586, and *Sarlls v. United States*, 152 U. S. 570. In the case first mentioned the court held that the use of the word "liquors" in a proviso in the tariff act of 1833, which declared that there should be no rebate of duty, "for breakage, leakage, or damage of wines, liquors, cordials, or distilled spirits," was not broad enough to cover beer. While the court did say that the term "liquors" is frequently, if not generally, used to define spirits or distilled beverages in contradistinction to those that are fermented, the gravamen of its decision was that the context was such as to indicate that the term was used in the proviso in a special rather than a general sense, and was intended to include only spirituous and distilled liquors. In the case secondly mentioned all that the court decided was that lager beer was not "spirituous liquors" or "wine" within the meaning of those terms as used in section 2139 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. It is hard to see how any judge or, for that matter, layman, unless tipsy from the use of spirituous liquors or wine himself, could have reached any other conclusion. But there is nothing whatever in the context of the eighteenth amendment to indicate that the words "intoxicating liquors" in that amendment were intended to be used in a special sense as importing spirituous and distilled liquors only, and there is everything in the "historic genesis," to use a judicial phrase, of the eighteenth amendment, to indicate that the words "intoxicating liquors" were used in it in a general sense to interdict any kind of intoxicating beverage, distilled, brewed, or fermented.

Discussion in every form before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment and the history of the times clearly demonstrate that the object of the prohibition amendment in its last stages was to write into the Federal Constitution nothing less than a sweeping denunciation of every sort of strong drink, ardent or temperate, that makes a man drunk.

PROPOSED BAN ON SPIRITS

Difficult, therefore, indeed, is it to agree with Justice Hoyt in thinking that it is improbable that the Supreme Court would strike down his definition of "intoxicating liquors" if it were introduced into the national prohibition law and the attempt were made to enforce it by

provisions which not only freshly carried into effect the power of the Federal Government to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and so forth, of spirituous and distilled liquors but sought to leave to the States the power to regulate the liquor traffic, so far as brewed and fermented liquors are concerned, free from all the limitations of the eighteenth amendment. Nor is it likely that even if the definition of Justice Hoyt could be reduced to lawful practice prohibition would then fade off the political screen and distilled liquor sink into the shameful status of drugs and narcotics. The substitution of the use of wine and malt liquors for spirituous liquors, so far as practicable, is, of course, an ideal that any civilized community might well set before itself, and no system of liquor control is wisely conceived that does not prescribe far sterner safeguards for the use of spirituous liquors than for the use of wine and malt liquors. But there are no substantial grounds for thinking that the human appetite for spirituous liquors could ever be totally displaced by the use of wine and malt liquors and, of course, if this is true, the bootlegger, even if the plan of Justice Hoyt were validly consummated, would still have a flourishing vocation.

The true plan for redressing the evils and abuses of prohibition is to amend the eighteenth amendment in one or the other of the leading ways which have been proposed by different individuals.

There is, to begin with, the plan founded on the Quebec plan, of liquor control, compounded partly of government supervision and partly of local option, which is contained in the proposed amendment to the eighteenth amendment introduced into the United States Senate at the last session of Congress.

Then there is the plan suggested by Dr. F. W. Buck, the executive secretary of the Federal Dispensary Tax Reduction League, which provides that the eighteenth amendment shall be so amended as to read as follows: "Congress shall provide by appropriate legislation for the manufacture and transportation of intoxicating beverages, and for the sale thereof, in packages, under a system of governmental permits and restrictions, and provide penalties for the violation of such laws, permits, and regulations: *Provided, however*, that no such permits shall be issued therefor in any State or Territory whose laws prohibit the manufacture, transportation, or sale of intoxicating beverages; nor in any political subdivision of the United States of America (outside of the District of Columbia) until requested by an act of the legislature, or referendum, of such political subdivision."

Again, there is the plan suggested by Courtlandt Nicoll, the distinguished member of the New York bar, which provides that the eighteenth amendment shall be so amended as to read as follows: "Except as authorized by Congress, the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all Territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof, for beverage purposes, is hereby prohibited."

And again, there is the plan of Mr. Pierre S. du Pont, one of the strongest wheel horses in the antiprohibition movement, which suggests that the eighteenth amendment shall be so amended as to provide that it shall remain operative throughout the United States and all Territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof until one or more States shall have established a system of state-wide control, whereupon it shall become inoperative in such State, or States; and, further, that when three-fourths of the States shall have established such systems of control it shall become inoperative everywhere.

ALTERNATIVE PLANS

Each of these plans has its special merits from one point of view or another. The plan founded on the Quebec system of liquor control enjoys the advantage of having been successfully tested by actual administrative experience, and has the merit of bringing national prohibition to an end simultaneously with the adoption of the plan, though with a saving clause providing for local option. The Buck plan resembles the Quebec plan, and yet, with its broad provisions relating to local option, is so flexible as to be free from the reproach of being a mere servile imitation of a foreign model. The Nicoll plan is even more flexible in that, while it continues national prohibition, as it now exists, it subjects it to the power of Congress to deal with it as Congress chooses. The Du Pont plan also continues prohibition in the same manner, but subject to the right, not of Congress, but of one or more of the States, to displace it at any time with a system of state-wide control within its or their limits, and subject to the condition that it shall come wholly to an end so soon as three-fourths of the States shall have carried this process of displacement into effect. The feature of the Du Pont plan that recommends it to many minds, is, of course, the fact that its tendency is in the end, though gradually, to restore jurisdiction over the liquor traffic to the States exclusively. The unrestricted simplicity of the Nicoll plan is a strong point in its favor, but, on the other hand, the facilities that it might afford for permanently keeping up the agitation of the prohibition question in Congress is a point not to be overlooked.

With some slight rephrasings of secondary significance, we believe that the Buck plan is the most eligible of all these plans. It is simple and elastic in structure. It contemplates the amendment only of the eighteenth amendment, and keeps clear of anti-Volstead Act deceit and illusion. It retains national control of the liquor traffic, but subject

to local initiative both as respects prohibition and license. Of all the plans it can at least be said that they avoid the tactical disadvantages of such an uncompromising undertaking as the entire repeal with a single breath of the eighteenth amendment, and the risks of moral retreat and scattered control which might attend its success. Unlike mere tinkering with the Volstead Act, each one of the plans mentioned, if put into effect, might secure a real solid measure of relief from the detestable scandals and abuses of unconditional prohibition. They all take the prohibition problems by the smooth handle, and they all move toward its solution along the lines of least resistance. With the exception of the Nicol plan, they all reserve to every State in the Union the right to have in one way or another absolute prohibition within its own borders, if it so wills, and the plan first mentioned confers upon local communities, even more restricted than States, the same right.

COMMENTS ON POLITICAL CONDITIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk three editorials dealing with matters before Congress and of general interest, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World, January 4, 1930]

THE YIELDING MOOD

In no unfriendly or partisan spirit it may be pointed out that the Hoover administration is exhibiting certain symptoms of a dangerous weakness. In those matters which lie wholly within the field of executive decision Mr. Hoover has been bold, resolute, and imaginative; but in those matters which involve Congress and call for leadership he manifests an increasing disposition to fumble the issue and to run to cover. We refer specifically to the following matters:

1. The recent appointments of Federal judges in Kansas and in Pennsylvania are a flagrant departure from the standard proclaimed by Mr. Hoover at the beginning of his administration. It is no secret that both appointments were made over the protest of his own Attorney General and that they constituted a surrender to senatorial pressure.

2. In respect to the tariff Mr. Hoover has declined to make his own position clear, with the result that his party, which a year ago polled the largest majority in American history, has lost control of Congress.

3. In respect to prohibition Mr. Hoover has allowed the dries to force him into a position where he is violating what the wet Republicans believed to be the promise of a searching and impartial investigation.

4. In foreign policy the fear aroused by the irreconcilables in the Senate has led him to a refusal to allow Americans to cooperate with dignity and responsibility in the international bank. The same fear is leading him to weaken the Kellogg pact, on which he had intended to base his foreign policy.

We do not wish to minimize the difficulty which a President has in leading Congress against its will. Nevertheless, that is what Presidents of the first rank invariably do. The country rarely fails to support them. The others give up the attempt to lead, yield this, that, and the other thing, and by the very fact of yielding, by the very confession of their own fear, stimulate Congress to greater and greater demonstrations of its power over the Executive.

Mr. Hoover will find that if he continues in the yielding mood there is no limit to what he will be asked and forced to yield.

[From the Baltimore Sun, January 6, 1930]

OMENS OF FIRES AHEAD

Those who believe in signs attach great significance to the fact that both the White House and Capitol have recently caught on fire after over a century of being free from flames any hotter than those engendered in debate. They think the fires are an omen, and that before many months both the President and Congress will be worked into such a state of friction that fires will be breaking out everywhere.

If this happens, it will be because President Hoover, while admitted by all his admirers to be a great engineer, is not a great fireman. It is up to him primarily to determine whether Congress catches on fire, and to succeed in controlling matters he will have to do much more than he did at the White House, where he is reported to have stood by and smoked.

When Congress reconvenes it will immediately be concerned with two hot propositions. One is the tariff, which, so far as the Senate is concerned, was born in the sweltering heat of last summer and has picked up heat ever since. The other is prohibition, which it seems almost as a result of spontaneous combustion caught on fire during the holidays.

So far as the tariff is concerned, all factions in the Senate claim to be agreed that it must have the right of way until some kind of a bill is finished. That of itself is a worthy resolve—there is every reason for getting the tariff bill out of the way—but the Senate certainly ought to be advised about what kind of a bill the President, who has the last say, wants. As has been pointed out repeatedly, the Senate coalition is passing an altogether different bill from that which the President smilingly saw through the House.

The bill being framed by Democrats and Republican insurgents of the upper branch comes far closer to meeting the requirements laid down by Mr. Hoover in his special tariff message than that passed by the House, but an outstanding fact is that he did absolutely nothing to stop the House program. Therefore the question arises whether the Senate coalition is merely working to have a bill killed in conference or doing what the President wants. In that uncertainty there is, the possibility of all kinds of fire, which the Chief Executive, if he really believes in fire prevention, might eliminate by making his tariff position clear.

While the tariff is presumably going to have the right of way in the Senate, there is every reason to believe that the debate will be continually punctured by rowing over prohibition. At the center of the row will probably lie the expected preliminary report of the President's Law Enforcement Commission and the naming of a joint congressional committee to deal with enforcement.

The making of a preliminary report by the Law Enforcement Commission seems to have been inspired primarily by an effort to quiet the howling dries. If this is the case, it is a shocking proceeding. To take a lot of notably self-respecting citizens, ask them to make a thorough study of all laws and the means of their enforcement, and then require them to give a half-baked report forces upon them a grave intellectual dishonesty. No helpful handling of a great and enormously complicated problem can come from it.

If the Commission on Law Enforcement is worthy of the distinguished names attached to it, it ought to be given its own good time to make an honest study, and it ought to be allowed to report its convictions on the fundamental issues involved. And if Mr. Hoover has real talent as an extinguisher of congressional fires, he should recognize that fact, junk any preliminary reports as a mistake bred of timorousness, and tell his commission to go ahead and do a thoroughly honest job.

Whether or not Mr. Hoover will do either of these things remains to be seen. The present indications are that he will not, but will keep on smoking while the Senate struggles along toward an unknown tariff goal, and the dries continue to make an intellectual monstrosity out of what was heralded as a sincere attempt to get toward the bottom of the prohibition question. If he does, however, those who believe that the fires in Washington during the holidays were omens have some chance of being right.

[From the Washington Herald, January 7, 1930]

CALVIN COOLIDGE WILL COME BACK UNLESS DEMOCRATS FIND A LEADER

When Hoover was elected the people thought that he knew everything.

Apparently he does not know everything, and sometimes it seems as if he does not know anything.

Whenever a situation arises where action is required from the President, the President appoints a commission to secure information and to investigate indefinitely, and postpone action indefinitely.

As the Denver Post truly says:

"What good are these commissions anyhow?"

We know that cheap politicians use them to dodge situations and avoid issues.

But Mr. Hoover is not a cheap politician; in fact, there are many who say he is not a politician at all.

However, there is no harm and perhaps much Democratic good in being enough of a politician to know what the people want done and to do it.

The kind of politicians that are ridiculed and resented are the kind that know what the people want and do not do it.

Mr. Hoover apparently is not either of these two kinds of politicians, and this may be said not in praise, but in apology.

He apparently has made something of a failure of his administration to date, not merely because he does not do what the people want but because he evidently does not know what they want.

He seems to believe, with Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, that he was elected on the issues of prohibition and religion, and so is allowing himself to be led not by the public but by the fanatics.

It is a little too soon to forecast what the result will be, but the first result will probably be a progressive Democratic House of Representatives; the second result a Republican Senate, but one opposed to many of the President's policies, particularly his foreign policies; and the third result the election of a progressive Democratic President in 1932.

These results would be certain if the Democrats had any competent leadership.

But what can be expected of a Democratic Party which abandons the example and injunctions of its founders and all the great and successful leaders who established it, to go ghost dancing after the wraith of the unsound and unsuccessful leader who wrecked it?

So the leaderless Democrats may not be able to take advantage of their opportunity, and this means that Calvin Coolidge will come back.

CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on yesterday afternoon I discussed the problem of the Philippine Islands. I have here

an editorial from the New Republic dealing with the subject, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

[From the New Republic, November 6, 1929]

THE OPEN DOOR IN THE PHILIPPINES

Secretary Stimson has again interceded with the Senate in regard to the Philippines. This time his intercession has been directed against the Vandenberg resolution to extend the American coastwise shipping laws to the Philippine Islands. Legislation already authorizes the President thus to exclude foreign shipping from American-Philippine trade. But no President has exercised his power in this respect, simply because of the damage it would do to Philippine commerce and international relations. Regardless of these considerations, the beet-sugar cohorts, having failed in their efforts to impose a tariff upon Philippine sugar, hope to secure their ends by an increase in shipping costs which the exclusion of foreign vessels from the Philippine trade would involve. Secretary Stimson attacks such a proposal, not only on the ground that it would retard commerce, but also on the ground that it would be interpreted as a repudiation of our policy of the open door.

While we sympathize with Mr. Stimson's position in regard to this shipping proposal, the difficulty is that it does not go far enough. Several months ago he pleaded with the Senate to continue the present free-trade régime with the Philippines. But as the New Republic has already pointed out this free-trade régime, which discriminates against the trade of every country except the United States, is in itself a flagrant violation of the open door. How can Mr. Stimson logically criticize the proposal to extend our coastwise shipping laws to the Philippines at the same time that he defends the maintenance of the present tariff régime? An American citizen has exactly the same right to trade in the mandate of Palestine or the mandate of Tanganyika as a British citizen, despite the fact that the administration of both these areas is in the hands of the British Government. A British citizen, however, must pay a high duty in trading with the Philippines, although an American citizen's goods may enter free. As long as the United States follows the policy of the closed door in the Philippines, these islands will not be able to trade freely with China and Japan. Denied an equal access to Philippine markets, Japanese and Chinese business men will resent the political control maintained by the United States. If all the colonial powers throughout the world should adopt the tariff policy which this country now follows in the Philippines—if, for example, British traders could enter British colonies free, while all other traders had to pay heavy duties—colonies would once again become an important cause of war. It is mere hypocrisy for the United States to talk of advancing peace when we follow economic policies that deliberately create international ill will.

There is an even stronger reason why the New Republic is opposed to the American tariff in the Philippines—and that is because it works injury upon the Filipinos. There is something artificial in the fact that a country 7,000 miles removed from the Philippines now dominates their trade. The tariff policy of the United States in diverting trade from its natural channels has tended to obstruct economic development in the islands; and what is of more importance, it has tended to make the Philippines an economic dependency of the United States. The longer this policy persists the greater the dependency becomes, and the more difficult it will be for the Philippines, once they gain their independence, to organize their economic life so that they can maintain their political autonomy. Mr. Stimson can not be in favor of the open door and yet be in favor of the existing tariff. Is his defense of this régime due to a belief that he is really defending the interests of the Philippine people, or is it due to a conviction, perhaps unconscious, that these islands should always remain a part of the United States?

Of course, it would be harmful and unjust for the United States to impose a tariff upon Philippine imports and yet insist upon the free admission of American products into the Philippines. The solution lies in granting the Philippine government tariff autonomy—the right to a tariff policy which will increase Philippine trade in the best markets, and not in the markets of the United States alone. It is only through the exercise of this power that the Philippines will be able to build up an economic system which will make political independence possible. If Mr. Stimson believes in the open door, if he is really concerned with the welfare of the Philippine people, if he is interested in removing the economic causes of war, let him go before the Senate and advocate a policy of tariff autonomy. We hope that there are some Senators and Representatives still left in Washington who remember the solemn pledges made by the United States to the Philippine people in the Jones Act and elsewhere. The first step in the fulfillment of our pledge is to assist them in laying an economic foundation for it.

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received the following telegram from the Governor of Kentucky, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY., January 9, 1930—5.35 p. m.

The SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C.:

I have this day appointed JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, of Barbourville, Knox County, Ky., as Senator in the Congress of the United States to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Frederic M. Sackett, and have to-day caused to be entered on the journal of office of the governor the following executive order:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

Whereas the resignation of Hon. Frederic M. Sackett causes a vacancy to exist in the office of United States Senator from the State of Kentucky for the term ending with March 3, 1931, I, Flem D. Sampson, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by authority of the Constitution of the United States and the act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, approved March 17, 1914, hereby designate and appoint Hon. JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, of the county of Knox, this State, to the office of Senator in the Congress of the United States, vice Hon. Frederic M. Sackett, resigned, to serve until the people of this State fill the vacancy by election as provided by law.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Kentucky to be affixed.

Done at Frankfort, the capital, this 9th day of January, A. D. 1930, the one hundred and thirty-eighth year of the Commonwealth.

FLEM D. SAMPSON, Governor.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

ELLA LEWIS, Secretary of State.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is the telegram just read from the desk designed to take the place of the ordinary certificate of the governor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not so intended, but the President of the Senate received it, it is addressed to the Senate, and the Chair thought it was his duty to have it read.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

Mr. BORAH subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning there was laid before the Senate a telegram purporting to be a certificate of appointment by the Governor of the State of Kentucky of a Member of this body. I made inquiry at the time as to whether that telegram was to be regarded as a certificate of appointment. Since that time I have been informed that it was to be so regarded.

Mr. President, I do not desire to consent to the swearing in of a Senator in this Chamber upon a telegram. There is no reason why the certificate of appointment of a Senator should not be sent here. Such a certificate can easily come from Kentucky in 24 hours. While in all probability the telegram states the facts as they are, it seems to me that we ought not to establish the precedent of having Senators sworn in upon a telegram.

REVISION OF THE TARIFF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. B. G. Dahlberg on the subject of the sugar tariff.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CELOTEX CO.,

En Route Chicago to Los Angeles, January 3, 1930.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: If ever the sugar growers of continental United States needed help, they need it now.

The ruinously low prices to which sugar has fallen by reason of almost criminal dumping from Cuba, emphasize more strongly than ever the need for proper tariff protection against this cheap, pauper-labor product.

The sugar tariff, I presume, will shortly come up in the Senate, and as one who has large interests as a sugar farmer in both Louisiana and Florida I urge most strongly the necessity for prompt and proper tariff readjustment to a point where the American farmer can live.

The recent disclosures in connection with the Cuban tariff help to indicate the terrific odds against which the American producer has been battling, to what lengths Cuba has gone, and to what underhanded methods she has resorted in an attempt to destroy and forever remove domestic sugar growing in America.

It would seem almost as if this tariff situation had gotten down to the question, "Is the American sugar farmer to be browbeaten and put out

of business by the foreign Cuban interests, or is the Government of the United States going to protect its citizens against the invasion by aliens?"

It has been rightly said that no nation is independent in fact unless it produces within its own boundaries the necessary foodstuffs to feed its own people. We here in the United States produce practically all such foodstuffs, with the important exception of sugar. We here in the United States are capable—that is, we have the lands, climate, the required labor, and machinery—of producing a very large amount of the sugar consumed by the country if the cane and beet sugar people were but given a reasonable chance to live.

Let us think a little more about our own people and less about the foreign and anti-American propaganda so freely spread about by Cuban sugar interests.

I sincerely trust that when this subject comes up in the Senate you will do your share to help the American farmer.

Very truly yours,

B. G. DAHLBERG.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] proposes, on page 121, line 12, to strike out "1.5425 cents" and to insert "1.24 cents."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BROUSSARD addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	Keyes	Shortridge
Ashurst	George	King	Simmons
Baird	Gillett	McCulloch	Smith
Bingham	Glass	McKellar	Smoot
Black	Goff	McMaster	Steiwer
Blaine	Gould	McNary	Sullivan
Blease	Greene	Metcalf	Swanson
Borah	Grundy	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Brock	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Tydings
Broussard	Hatfield	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hawes	Overman	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Patterson	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hedin	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Dill	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fess	Kean	Schall	
Fletcher	Kendrick	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Louisiana will proceed.

Mr. BROUSSARD resumed and concluded his speech, which is as follows:

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, since I came to the Senate it has been said thousands of times that it is not possible to afford protection to agriculture. It has been claimed that tariff rates on agricultural products are ineffective. For many years past those who sympathized with the agricultural classes have been devising means for the relief of the farmer, because agricultural products were not affected by tariff rates, and various measures with that object in view have been proposed to Congress.

Many of those measures have been rejected; a number of them have been passed by Congress, but were vetoed by the President. It was only after many years of debate and consideration that Congress finally compromised its differences with the Chief Executive and passed a bill which it was claimed would afford relief to the farmer. After such legislation was enacted, however, the majority of the Senate, realizing that the relief provided had not been sufficient, not very long ago adopted, for the second time, the debenture plan, intended to afford relief to the growers of agricultural products. The only excuse for the advocacy of that measure is that most of the agricultural products are not affected by tariff rates.

Even the growers of cotton and of wheat, who raise large surpluses of those agricultural products, have been provided for in the debenture proposal and in the farm relief bill. There is being considered now the location of a \$30,000,000 organization under the Federal Farm Relief Board, to be exclusively devoted to the benefit of the producers of cotton which is

grown in the South. Not a single Senator on this side representing a cotton State failed to join in the effort to extend relief to the cotton farmer. The debenture plan, if finally adopted, will give to the cotton raiser 2 cents per pound as a specific bonus for every pound of cotton which shall be exported.

The friends of the wheat growers joined in that effort, and there are some Senators on the other side of the Chamber who openly avowed on the floor that they were asking for a rate greatly in excess of that justified by evidence produced before the committee for the purpose of increasing the 50 per cent certificate which the farmers are to receive for exporting those agricultural products.

In other words, if the producers of a certain commodity would be satisfied with 10 cents a bushel or 20 cents a bushel, it was sought to have the debenture doubled in order that when the producers exported 1 bushel they would still be getting 100 per cent of what they had expected to get originally before they compromised and accepted 50 per cent of the tariff rate.

I wish, now, to make a comparison with which I am very familiar. One half of my State produces cotton, while the other half produces sugar and rice. I recall distinctly in the eighties and in the early nineties that cotton and sugar sold for approximately the same price. Since my coming to the Senate it has never failed that when the price of cotton fell below 20 cents a pound, my friends on this side of the Chamber representing the cotton-growing States invited me to a conference with a view of devising means to increase the price. So every effort was made sometime ago to have the Government official responsible for promulgating the cotton statistics dismissed from the service for making false reports as to the probable yield of the cotton crop. We would send for the Government officials and rake them over the coals for predicting the production of a larger crop than the cotton growers thought was justified.

In the late eighties and early nineties sugar sold for between 4½ and 6 cents a pound, sometimes for 7 cents a pound; cotton sold for about the same price. There is not a cotton farmer here who will challenge the statement that it is much more expensive to produce sugar than it is to raise cotton.

It requires a much larger investment, better implements, better teams and factories to complete that product. Yet we find the fight against sugar being led by one of our friends on this side of the Chamber who comes from a cotton State adjoining Louisiana, and at the same time, when cotton is selling for 20 cents, voting for the debenture so as to give the cotton producers 2 cents additional.

Sugar is selling for \$3.70 a hundred pounds, and our entire crop for the year 1929 in Louisiana brought the farmers \$3.70 a ton; but we find these friends of ours here who are protesting against any increase in the tariff rate on sugar—and I do not doubt that they would be willing to vote for a reduction if that were possible—at the same time willing to boost cotton, selling for 20 cents, by adding 2 additional cents, so as to make the price 22 cents a pound, when, pound for pound, sugar costs possibly 50 per cent more to produce than does cotton.

Mr. President, why all this hue and cry against sugar? Ever since I was old enough to read the newspapers I have been reading propaganda issued by the American sugar refining interests of this country, even before we made our convention with Cuba. They took care of themselves, and in order to take care of themselves and to have a rather free hand in the handling of sugar they took care of the Cuban people. In every barrel and every package of sugar that was sold there was a printed statement, setting forth "the tariff on this product is 1½ cents, and you are paying 1½ cents more because of that tariff."

That is not true, Mr. President, as I shall later show. It is not the experience of this country that when the duty on sugar has been increased the price has been raised to the extent of the increase in the tariff rate. The facts are quite to the contrary. I have evidence, and will produce it to the Senate, to show that what one would expect to occur does not occur, and that in every instance during the last 30 or 40 years when the tariff on sugar has been increased there has followed a drop in the price of the commodity to the consumer.

Why is it that certain foreign sugar interests will organize and raise tremendous sums of money, as disclosed by the lobby committee now in session, and pour out that money for the circulation of propaganda against the one commodity that is now cheaper than it has ever been during the last 60 years? In fact, sugar has never been as cheap as it is now, because 60 years ago it was higher than it was 10 years ago.

Let me call attention to the fact that sugar is the only commodity which is served free in the restaurants and hotels of this country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator does not mean that it is served free.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It is served free.

Mr. BORAH. It is put on the table and appears to be served free, but the guest pays for it in his bill?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Is bread served free? Is not the passenger on a Pullman car or the guest at a hotel or restaurant charged 10 cents for bread to-day? On the other hand, one may go into any restaurant and fill his pockets with sugar and nobody in the restaurant will say anything about it.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I am with the Senator in the objective which he is seeking to bring about, but I had not supposed that anybody dining in a restaurant or hotel supposed that he was getting anything free. By the time the guest has paid his bill, he has paid for the sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It is not itemized. If the customer takes 10 lumps of sugar not a word will be said to him, and if he does not take any at all no reduction is made in his bill. If one asks for it, the hotel will send it to his room free.

Mr. BORAH. In many hotels bread is served free, for instance, but that does not make any difference in the sum total of the bill which is paid.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Bread was always free at the hotels until a few years ago.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it makes no difference whether a guest at a hotel uses sugar or not; it is not charged to him; and the hotel prices will be exactly the same irrespective of whether the tariff duties on sugar are 1½ cents a pound or 2 cents a pound or 2½ cents a pound or 3 cents a pound.

Mr. BORAH. We can not determine the question of the tariff because of the manner in which the hotels may juggle their figures with reference to the amount they finally charge.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Nobody is trying to do that.

Mr. SMOOT. Furthermore, the price of candy will be the same irrespective of the duty we may levy on sugar. The price of a pound of candy will be just the same whether we put this rate on sugar or whether we leave it off.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, nobody is trying to base the rate of duty which should be imposed on that ground, of course. I am merely pointing to one of the factors that is being used and which should be considered in fixing this tariff rate.

Sugar is the most concentrated of all foods. It is to-day the cheapest food on the market with the exception of rice.

Mr. SMOOT. It is cheaper than rice.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes; to-day it is even cheaper than rice. When the housewife buys sugar it is not perishable as are bread, butter, and other foods. It is in a condensed form and can be kept in almost any place in the house. It will not deteriorate; it contains no water at all. When one pays 75 cents a pound for meat to be cooked, about 75 per cent of it is water.

Time and attention must be expended, and gas or wood must be consumed, in order to cook it and prepare it. Those things must be done immediately, because otherwise it is lost.

Sugar, on the other hand, is condensed. It is practically 99.8 per cent pure food. Sugar is the best of all foods; there is no other single food that will compare to it; and there is no reason why those who are engaged in that industry should be called upon to join the other farmers and agriculturists of this Nation to increase the price of the products of those other agricultural people, thereby increasing the price to them when they buy it to consume it, and then be told that they ought not to be considered agriculturists at all. In fact, those who are leading this fight have tried to remove sugar as far as possible from the agricultural schedule. They want to make it appear that the hundreds of thousands of farmers engaged in this industry are manufacturers. It is contended that they are not farmers; they are manufacturers.

So many things have been said against sugar that it is impossible to reply to all of them; but serious men, without giving any close study to this proposition, will make the assertion that if a duty of 2.40 or 2.20 cents a pound is placed on sugar, and the consumption is 104 pounds per capita, the 104 pounds should be multiplied by 2.20. That is the most absurd argument ever presented to a sane people. I should be ashamed to make such an argument. I should be challenged by the most ignorant audience in the United States for making such a statement.

I make the assertion, and will establish it beyond any dispute, that the average consumption of sugar per capita in the United States, as sugar, is only 30 pounds. If the increase from 1.76 cents and a fraction to 2.20 cents is added, the average increase per family in the United States will be scarcely a dollar; and those are facts that I am going to present to the Senate. They are taken from the statistics of the Government departments.

It is impossible to trace all of the sugar that goes out of this country, no matter how hard anyone attempts to do it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection, I want to say that that takes in all of the sugar used in every branch of manufacture.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I am coming to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say also, in answer to the Senator from Idaho, that when the representative of the Hershey Chocolate Co. was before the committee, he pleaded with us with tears in his eyes not to raise the tariff on sugar, because he said if it should be raised the size of chocolate bars would have to be decreased; but when I asked him whether the size of chocolate bars had been increased when the decrease was made in sugar, he said, "Oh, no." It makes no difference whatever.

When the pop people came before the committee, they were very much concerned about what would happen to pop; and yet pop is the same as it was when sugar was almost twice as high as it is to-day. It made no difference in the size of the bottle. It made no difference as to the sales to the ultimate consumer.

So when people talk about this small increase of duty affecting the selling price of the article in which sugar is used, or the size of the article—

Mr. BROUSSARD. I wanted to cover that very subject.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not know whether the Senator was going to cover it or not; but, if the Senators will only read the testimony, they will find that there is nothing in that claim.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, so far as that is concerned, the Senators have read the testimony. I was not arguing the question which the Senator from Utah is arguing. I was arguing against the proposition that simply because sugar is free on the hotel table, or is not mentioned on the bill of fare, therefore, we do not pay for it. Of course, we pay for it, just the same as we pay for bread, although the bread may be free upon the table.

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; I beg to disagree with the Senator. If you get a portion of bread and want more bread, you have to pay for it again. You do not get a loaf of bread if you want one. They give you a portion of bread.

Now, I want to continue with the argument I was making.

As I said, the consumption of sugar as sugar in the home is 30 pounds per capita. Let me call this matter to the attention of some of the agriculturists here who have been voting for higher rates on their own agricultural products. Let us take the condensed-milk people.

As you know, 42 per cent of condensed milk is sugar. The manufacturer of condensed milk buys that sugar at \$4 to \$5 a hundred pounds, and when he sells the condensed milk he sells it at the rate of 15 cents a can; so that he is making more profit out of the sugar that he puts into the condensed milk than he makes out of the milk that he produces.

Take all of the fruits that are put up: Does anybody put up fruit and sell it for \$3.78 a hundred pounds? There is anywhere from 12 to 15 and 20 and 60 and 70 per cent of sugar in these products; but the man who puts them up is buying the sugar at 4 or 5 cents and selling the product at 10 or 15 cents; and whatever component part of that product is sugar is a clear profit that he makes for himself, which always exceeds that which he makes upon his own product.

Take the confectioner: The same situation exists. Go and buy candies, and you find the same thing. If you buy chewing gum, and figure the rate for which the manufacturer sells the gum as compared with the cost of sugar, of course, that price embodies and includes the sugar that is in the gum, and he sells it at that rate.

To account for the other 74 pounds per capita that is not consumed directly as sugar, millions of pounds, even billions of pounds—and I will give all these figures—are exported from this country in condensed milk, confectionery, candies, meats of all kinds, tobacco, and thousands of products in the manufacture and finishing of which sugar is used. These are exported, and, of course, they figure in the 104 pounds per capita which it is claimed the American people consume.

Many of these manufacturers bring sugar into this country, refine it in bond, and reexport it; and they get 99 per cent of the tariff rate refunded to them. All of that is included in the gross consumption to which people usually refer, which gives the result of 104 pounds per capita.

In other words, I make the broad assertion that 74 pounds of the 104 pounds of sugar which it is claimed the American people consume per capita is consumed by the American public in the preparation of other articles which they buy, and that the sugar contained therein does not and can not affect at all the price of the product containing the sugar. So it is immaterial to us whether the baker pays 3 cents for his sugar or 5

cents for his sugar; he is not going to change the price at which he sells his product.

As I said a while ago, Mr. President—and doubtless it will be discussed during this debate—many, many thousands of dollars have been expended to give out misinformation on this subject, to prejudice the people against this commodity, and to insist upon a reduction of the duty or, in any event, no increase of it. Who are these people? Whom do they represent?

I am sure that those who oppose this duty will refer to the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, made to the President in 1926, fixing the difference in the cost of production between the Cuban and the American producers. If they are correct in that, if that report was true at that time, then the Cuban people are guilty of dumping here. In other words, if it costs them more than a cent and a half to make their sugar—which is what I claim it costs them—then, when they sell their sugar delivered in New York in bond for 1.76, they are dumping here. Where is the Senator who, if he argues that and believes that, would be willing to vote to permit a large class of agriculturists in this country, who are paying taxes to this Government, to be crushed for the benefit of the Cubans?

I do not think anyone could defend that angle of the matter at all. Why should the American Congress, trying to grant relief to the agricultural classes in this country, select the sugar people and say, "So far as you are concerned, inasmuch as we are in a sense guardians of the Cubans, we will permit them to sell their sugar at half its cost in order to destroy you"? I should like to know if anybody will avowedly vote that way.

Then, if the cost is really a cent and a half—which they have demonstrated all through last year, practically—if that is true, I do not think anybody here will contend that we can make sugar—cane or beet—at \$3.70 a ton.

The farmers can not pay their expenses with sugar selling at that price. I want to repeat, the cotton farmers are having a hard time with cotton at 18 cents a pound. Sugar costs more than cotton to produce, and we are asked to get along on \$3.70 a hundred pounds, which is 3.7 cents a pound. I do not see any spirit of fairness in that.

Let us go back to the tariff investigation that was begun in 1923. Who asked for that investigation? It was asked for by the United States Sugar Association. I have here on my desk a list of the companies that comprise the United States Sugar Association, and it reads like a telephone directory over in Habana. There is not an American name in it. The consumers in this country did not protest against the price of sugar at that time. The wholesalers and retailers of sugar did not complain to the Tariff Commission and ask for an investigation to reduce the rate. It was those Cuban interests; and, if Senators will read the report, they will find that the investigation was instituted by the United States Sugar Association, a company composed of members operating exclusively in Cuba.

It is well for the American people to know who are trying to reduce this duty. Where is the demand in this country for a reduction of rates? I have received the same letters and telegrams all Senators have received. They were sent from the northern part of my State, where the people are not familiar with sugar, where they are cotton growers exclusively. In order to get some demand, after they were challenged, to show who asked for it, what did they do? The Coca-Cola people and the soft-drink manufacturers came together and got in touch with every soft-drink manufacturer throughout the United States. They prepared telegrams and sent them here, and prepared letters and sent them here in an effort to show a demand in this country for a reduction in the price of sugar. No reasonable housewife will protest against the price of sugar when she can buy it for less than 5 cents a pound at retail anywhere in the United States. But these telegrams came.

I was very much interested in trying to find out why housewives in certain towns in my State were joining together and, on the same day, sending me, for instance, from a town of five or six hundred people, 50 telegrams protesting against my course on the sugar question. I knew they were not paying for them, because, as I stated a while ago, the cost of each of those telegrams, if we get \$2.20 per hundred pounds, pay for the increase for a family for a whole year, and they were spending that money before the question was ever debated before the Senate.

I went to a Member of Congress here from one of the Louisiana districts and asked him about the class of people from whom I was hearing, and I selected the most substantial man in the community to which I referred. I had received a telegram from his wife, which I have here. I wired back to her that I stood for a tariff on all agricultural products and on such industrial products as I thought ought to have additional protection, and the husband wired me, "My wife never wired

to you." He then got busy and located the manufacturer of soft drinks in the town of Minden and found out that the soft-drink manufacturer had sent many telegrams on the one day and had forged the name of this particular sender, because I have the letter from him and from her authorizing me to produce them. The soft-drink manufacturer in that town, complying with the request of this organization, the Coca-Cola Co. and the soft-drink bottlers association in the United States, were paying for those telegrams, and the local fellow was forging the names of ladies in that town in order to influence the legislation.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator has been discussing mainly cane-sugar production. I am considerably interested in finding out whether the beet-sugar production can be increased under proper favorable legislation, so as to justify our increasing the protection. I would like to state, as a prefatory remark, that I have always looked upon sugar as a splendid example of what protection could do. Back in 1922 I favored protection on sugar.

I remember the former Secretary of Agriculture said that there were in the United States over 200,000,000 acres of land that could produce sugar, or the material out of which sugar was made, and that there was a possibility of our approaching a time when, by the employment of American labor, we could produce a large proportion of our sugar consumption.

I have been somewhat disappointed in what has taken place since 1922 in the increase in the production of that product. It throws a dampening effect upon one who is anxious to increase the production of an article that is of such great value in the home consumption. Unless we can do that, it is a question with me how far we should go in protecting an article where the protection might increase the price. I am sympathetic with the argument, but I am somewhat distressed.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I shall not attempt, of course, to speak with authority as to what the possibilities of the beet industry are, except from such information as I have been able to gather by reading on the subject. I recall especially hearing the testimony of ex-Secretary of Agriculture Jardine before the Finance Committee. He stated most positively that we could produce all the sugar we need in this country. But let me explain to the Senator the reason why the situation is so deplorable, and it follows exactly what I said a while ago. We have never increased a tariff rate once in the last 40 years but that the Cuban people immediately absorbed the increase, and what increase they did not absorb, if there was any, the refining interests absorbed. We have had a fall in price practically every time. That is strange, but it is true, and it can be established.

What has been the reason for that? It is easy to understand. Does not the Senator see the great possibility of a combine such as there is now in Cuba, with all of its management centered in Wall Street, one billion and a half dollars, American money, invested in the sugar industry in Cuba?

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that propaganda against this duty has absolutely no effect on me at all, because I know it is propaganda.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator from Michigan stated yesterday how much it cost to the American consuming public in 1920 in the increased bill for sugar—billions of dollars. That is the goal these people have in sight. If we increase the tariff on sugar, these people will go as far as they can to depress the price to prevent the natural results we expect should increase the production.

As soon as the Ways and Means Committee began consideration of the tariff bill, they dropped the price of sugar, and sold it for \$1.76 in New York, delivered.

The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will say that the difference in the cost of production between the Cuban and American producers is very, very small, and he will cite the report of the three members of the Tariff Commission. If he holds that, then he must admit that the Cubans, through the Americans interested in Cuba, are dumping that sugar to crush us. Is he willing to defend that? That is what is happening.

When we raised the duty in 1920 from 1 cent, under the Underwood Act, to \$1.60, under the emergency tariff act, they dropped the price. When we raised it to \$1.76, they dropped the price. The margin of the refiner was cut, and the Cuban producer absorbed the rest of it, but they sold cheaper than we had been selling before because they wanted to prevent other people from going into the industry. That is why there is this situation.

I have contended, and I think anybody who studies the tariff question will concede, that the tariff is not the sole element in fixing price. That applies particularly to a product that is con-

sumed throughout the world. There are many elements that determine a price.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an interruption?

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It has been contended that the sugar mills are seasonal, and can only operate a certain short period of the year, and that for that reason the production of sugar is not profitable either to the farmer who raises the beet or the capitalist who invests his money in sugar manufacture, therefore that it is not very promising. What does the Senator say to that argument?

Mr. BROUSSARD. There are many other industries in the same condition, which do not operate the year around. I think the arrangement which was arrived at many years ago, in both the beet and the cane industry, where the manufacturer shares the profits by a fixing of the price on a sliding scale for the cane or the beet, is a good one. There is a deterrent to capital in having its dollars invested in a plant that is idle nine months of the year which is shared by the farmer in having a plant to crush his cane or beet. I think it is a cooperative plan, and before we adopt that plan, it was very unsatisfactory, because our farmers were always willing to take the refiner by the throat. To-day the prices are fixed, and everybody has the same contract throughout the cane district. Of course, the manufacturers are not refiners. We do not make white sugar, with a few exceptions.

Mr. FESS. I am very much obliged to the Senator.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I want to go on with the question of beet production. I have no hesitancy in saying that my belief, based upon the testimony of such men as Mr. Jardine and others who know the situation in the beet section, is that you can increase greatly the production of beets.

Mr. FESS. The Senator will understand the motive of my interruption. I am not antagonistic to the position he is taking. On the other hand, I am quite sympathetic. I am interrupting him because I do not know of anyone who has the information on the subject that he has. There are few arguing against the protection of this particular article having some effect, and that is why I wanted his opinion.

Mr. BROUSSARD. There is no question but what the Cuban people have given up the preferential we have allowed them. They have never used it at all. Their purpose is very clear.

The tariff is not the only element that fixes the price. I refer particularly to any commodity that is consumed throughout the world. There the element of supply and demand has a great deal to do with it. I would say that 90 per cent of the time a duty such as we propose to put on sugar will not affect at all the price of sugar to the consumer in this country. The reason why we are insisting upon an increase is that in times of overproduction such as we have had in the world recently, and with every other country in the world having a higher tariff against sugar than we have and this being the big sugar market of the world, the sugar produced elsewhere must be sacrificed. It is sent here for two purposes. They want to get it out of the way and they want to get cash for it, so they wipe it off their books. But the motive behind it is to crush or hamper the local industry so it shall not expand.

If we have a higher tariff rate on sugar than we have at the present time, that is one thing they must take into consideration when they go to dumping. If they are selling sugar at actual cost, at 1.5 cents plus 1.76 cents duty, and we raise the duty to 2.40 or 2.20, they must pay the difference between 1.76 and 2.20 or 2.40 before the sugar may enter here, and that is a deterrent and therefore an indirect benefit affording us protection against dumping. It is absolutely necessary, even when we have a world-price commodity, to have a tariff ample to protect under adverse circumstances and emergencies; otherwise the tariff does not figure at all in the price.

The same is true of wheat. The wheat farmers just south of the Canadian line insist upon a high tariff rate against Canadian wheat. They asked the Tariff Commissioner to increase it, and that was done. The House has adopted—and I think we have also adopted—the rate recommended by the Tariff Commission, which is a very high tariff rate; and still we are exporters of wheat. It is claimed that the farmers will benefit by that rate. So it is that we are asking to be benefited by an additional tariff protection so that we may get returns from the cultivation of our sugar beets or sugarcane that will justify farmers in continuing in that pursuit and induce others to increase it.

Meeting the question of the Senator from Ohio, let us suppose it is impossible to increase the production at all. I will take it from that angle of the situation. The fact is that we are contributing enormous sums of money to the Cuban people every

year under the arrangement we have. In the last 24 years the concessions which we have given to the Cuban producer, measured in dollars as compared to the concessions given to our manufacturers for goods shipped from the United States to Cuba, show an advantage to Cuba of over \$2,000,000,000. We are making them a present of that much money. It is money the American consumer is paying them. If we will divide that \$2,000,000,000 among the 3,500,000 souls in Cuba we will find that during that period of time we have made each individual in Cuba a present of considerably more than \$500. Why is it that men will hesitate to add a small increased tariff protection to the farmers of our own country on the basis that it will increase the cost of sugar to the consumer very slightly, when on the other hand they are making a present to the Cubans of such enormous sums of money every year?

Mr. President, we ought to take into consideration this fact. Beginning with the Republic of Brazil, which has a duty of 17 cents a pound on sugar and down to Great Britain, which has a tariff of 2.5 cents and a bounty of 2 cents a pound on sugar, we are to-day, and still will be, even if we adopt the proposed rate, the lowest on the list of countries, so far as tariff duties on sugar are concerned. We can not afford to continue to do business that way. We must increase the duty. It will be left to American ingenuity then to overcome the differences in the duties imposed by the respective countries, the rates of other countries being higher than ours.

Yesterday the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] asked a number of questions, all of which were directed to the point that we could not give relief to our people by increasing the tariff rates so long as the Philippine Islands are permitted to enter their sugar free of duty. I realize that, and fully understand that a situation may arise, if we are not to determine what is to be done with the Philippines, where their production of sugar may be greatly increased, which would leave us in a very precarious position. We have justified the sacrifices which the sugar producers in the United States have been called upon to make in order to develop the sugar industry in Cuba on the ground that inasmuch as we produce hardly one-half of the amount of sugar consumed in this country, we have to have a source of supply close at hand. But it is not difficult for the American people to understand that if we continue the policy with reference to the Philippines and permit them to expand, they will displace the sugar producer of this country. Then what would happen? We can not maintain lines of communication with the Philippine Islands in times of war to supply our people with sugar.

We are confronted with a very serious situation. I had offered an amendment to the pending bill, which was debated and voted upon, proposing to tax products from the Philippine Islands and to remit that tax to their treasury as compensation for our free entry of manufactured products into the Philippine Islands. Many objected to that plan. The alternative is to grant them independence, but one or the other must be done, and must be done soon. Since these questions were asked yesterday by the Senator from Idaho and the colloquy was had between him and me, I have decided to make another effort to solve the problem.

When we first took over the Philippine Islands and made our adjustments with them on the tariff policy between the two countries, we had a limitation on Philippine sugar of 300,000 tons. That remained in force until 1913, when the repeal of the limitation was had. The reenactment of it was an oversight, as I shall explain. The Underwood Act of 1913 provided for free sugar for three years following that year. In order that Congress would not have to come back to the sugar question again, the limitation was repealed with reference to the importation of Philippine sugar. It was not necessary to permit it to remain on the statute books, because sugar was to be permitted free entry from all countries.

There was a great deal of protest against the free-sugar clause. There was insurgency in some portions of the country against it. The free-sugar clause was repealed in 1914 or 1915, but by oversight, because it was in a different measure, it was not provided that there should be again a limitation against the Philippine Islands, and consequently they have been permitted to import into this country all the sugar they produce without limitation.

Congressman TIMBERLAKE in the House offered an amendment to the pending bill proposing to limit the importations to 500,000 tons. The Filipinos never protested against the 300,000-ton limitation. The demand did not come from them for the repeal. The repeal was simply the result of a new policy which it was sought to establish in this Government to put sugar on the free list. It was the first effort ever made in the history of the country. Therefore, an exception could not be made of one of our own possessions.

I propose to offer an amendment to this schedule limiting Philippine importations of sugar; in other words, I am trying to find some way in which to protect the American people. Many assume a rôle of charity, as it were, extend sympathy, and undertake to do things for people of other races in distant parts of the world, overlooking the suffering agriculturists in their own country. So far as I am concerned, I am determined to do everything I can in order to try to remedy this condition as it relates to the Philippine Islands, and I propose to offer an amendment limiting the importations of Philippine sugar into this country. I think it will be well for the sugar, cotton, and oil producers here to agitate this question, no matter what may happen in relation to it. We can not afford to sit quietly and permit the Filipinos to send 100 per cent of all the coconut oils which are imported into this country without duty and displace domestic vegetable oils. Nor am I willing to permit the people who are engaged in the beet and cane sugar industries in this country to be sacrificed for the benefit of the Filipinos, to whom we have promised independence, and who are now clamoring for it. I do not see that there is a difficult problem to solve in connection with the situation. We shall have to solve it in some way.

There are some Senators who, in order to save the consumer of sugar about \$1 per family per year, are willing to pay in trade advantages in addition to the price of the sugar over \$85,000,000 to Cuba annually on her sugar. The argument we meet here is not that the consumer pays the sugar tariff but when the Cuban himself appears here he claims that we are going to destroy the industry in Cuba; that he is paying the tariff; and that contention has been affirmed, it has been iterated and reiterated every time the tariff has been debated here. If the Cuban pays it, then the domestic consumer does not pay it; they both can not pay it. I contend that the Cubans have been absorbing all these benefits that we have been giving them, but if they do not absorb them, then, it is useless for us to make them a present of \$85,000,000.

(At this point Mr. BROUSSARD yielded to Mr. VANDENBERG, who suggested the absence of a quorum, and the roll was called.)

Mr. President, I wish to take up now the chief argument that is made against advancing the tariff duty on sugar. It is claimed that when the duty is raised, the price of sugar is necessarily increased. I wish to show what happened in the past, since the passage of the Wilson tariff bill. That was in 1894.

The Wilson bill imposed a duty of 40 per cent ad valorem on raw sugar, which amounted to \$1.056 per hundred pounds. This was absorbed by Cuba and the refiners. In order to prove that, the table which I have here, prepared by very reliable authorities from statistics, shows that in the two months before the Wilson bill went into effect the average price of Cuban sugar in bond in New York was \$3.27, and two months after that the average price of sugar in bond in New York was \$2.64. The average wholesale price of the refined for the same period was \$4.25 per hundred pounds before, and \$4.50 for the two months afterwards.

The effective increase in duty under the Dingley bill was 60.1 cents per hundred pounds, which was absorbed by the Cuban producers and American refiners to the extent of 40.3 cents per hundred pounds, as shown by the average price for the same 2-month period before and two months afterwards. The average price of raw sugar before was \$2.84½. The average after that increase was \$2.114. The price of refined sugar was \$4.46 before and \$4.75 afterwards; so that the 60 cents was entirely absorbed by the Cuban producer except the 15 cents per hundred pounds which the refiners absorbed.

The Cuban treaty became effective December 27, 1903, reducing the duty 33.7 cents per hundred pounds. In this case there was a reduction, and it was appropriated to the extent of 20.7 cents by the refiners, or 61.4 per cent of the entire reduction. The price of sugar in bond in New York two months before that treaty went into effect was \$2.064. Two months afterwards on the average, it was \$2.033. The wholesale price of sugar two months before averaged \$4.44. Two months afterwards it averaged \$4.31.

The Underwood bill of 1914 was effective in reducing the price 33.7 cents per hundred pounds, of which 18.2 cents was appropriated by the American refiners, or 54 per cent of the entire reduction. The average price of raw sugar before was \$2.025. The average price two months afterwards was \$1.97. The average refined price two months before was \$3.92 and two months afterwards it was \$3.76. And so it is, Mr. President; singular as it may appear, that has been the case.

I desire now to call attention to the investigations of the Tariff Commission, brought about by the United States Sugar

Association, which is a Cuban organization, as I said a while ago.

When the President ordered the Tariff Commission to make this investigation several questions were submitted. One of them was, What part did the increase of the duty play in the increase in the price of sugar at the time the President called the attention of the Tariff Commission to this rise? Was the tariff to blame or not? That was a question that they considered immediately.

The part relating to the difference in the cost of production required research work and investigations in the field, both in Cuba and in this country, and it took until 1926 to make it; but it will be found that the relation of the tariff on sugar to the rise in price of February and April, 1923, was as follows: Here is what the commission unanimously reported. They were not divided then as they became divided later.

I am reading now from page 1 of this document, published by the United States Tariff Commission in Washington, entitled, "Relation of the Tariff on Sugar to the Rise in Price of February-April, 1923."

In the first place the commission set out the telegram which President Harding sent them on March 27, 1923, as follows:

Have the Tariff Commission make an immediate inquiry into the relation of the sugar tariff to the current prices of that commodity. It is difficult to believe that the duty on sugar can have any part in making the abnormal prices which prevail, but if the commission finds there is any ground for believing the duty to be even partially responsible I shall be ready to proclaim a reduction in duty as provided by law.

Then the commission begins its report, as follows:

In making its report in response to the foregoing telegram the Tariff Commission acts upon the understanding that the President's request was distinctly directed to a specific and definite question, namely, whether the existing tariff duty on sugar is related to the current prices of sugar. In other words, the commission understands that it is requested to ascertain for the President whether or not the recent marked increase in the price of sugar during February-April, 1923, is attributable, in whole or in part, to the tariff duty fixed by the act of September 21, 1922.

Even in normal times numerous factors tend to affect the price of sugar in the United States, the present and anticipated demand of all countries of the world, the present stocks and anticipated production of all producing countries, the general credit situation, the present and anticipated prices of substitute or derivative products, the fluctuations in foreign exchanges, the changes in tariff rates here and abroad, and other factors.

In the last few years there have been uncertain elements, such as the degree of recovery of the purchasing power of Europe, the degree of restoration of the European beet-sugar industry, and the reorganization and integration of the Cuban industry following the havoc wrought by the speculation of the year 1920. A tariff on sugar in the United States is only one factor in an equation with numerous variables.

Mr. President, I hate to take up so much time; but I think those statements ought to be in the RECORD for anybody who wants to see them, because they are absolutely based upon sound economic reasons and logic.

I read from page 3, as follows:

The "current" price referred to in the President's telegram of March 27 is the most recent of the market fluctuations in sugar prices which have characterized the sugar market since the outbreak of the Great War. Previous to 1914 there were only relatively minor fluctuations in sugar prices as compared with the changes subsequent thereto. As will be noted from the diagram attached to this report, the present advance which has attracted so much attention is relatively small as compared with the rise in 1920; it is considerably less than the advance in the latter part of 1919; and, though somewhat sharper, about equals the advances in the years 1914, 1916, and 1917. Furthermore, it will be noted that in the first week of January, 1922, the price for Cuban 96° raw sugar dropped to 1.81, cost and freight, the lowest point recorded.

That was just prior to this rise; and I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this year sugar has sold for less than \$1.81, delivered in New York in bond.

With cost, freight, and duty of \$1.76, it has sold below \$3.70 in New York. That was lower than the point recorded in 1922.

Since that date there has been a general upward trend, which has continued to the present time, with temporary interruptions.

May I call the attention of those who are talking for the benefit of the consumer to the fact that they will see these rises always immediately after we are through harvesting our domestic crops? In my State no man in the sugar business, with

the narrow margin, can play with the market. He must pay for his cane every Saturday. He can not afford to hold the sugar. He can not play with that market; he must sell the sugar. Every time he has a hundred barrels or a hundred sacks he must sell. Some of them sell every night, some every week, and they collect on the sugar and pay the cane grower. They can not play the market. So that at this time of the year all of our sugar is sold. Then you will find the market as it was in January, 1922, as it is now, at the lowest price ever recorded, and then you will see the price that the President protested about in February and April, which you may expect, no matter what happens. That is what Cuba takes out of the American consumer. That is why I was opposed to the sliding scale, because the question of fixing the price to pay for the local raw sugar enters into consideration. The question of keeping books in New York, just as Mr. Lakin wrote, a company that gave out a statement, that it cost them \$1.50 to produce 100 pounds of sugar, and he protested against it and wanted to know if he could not cover it up.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, with Cuba's 5,000,000 tons of production, is it not practically possible for Cuba to control the market all the time?

Mr. BROUSSARD. It could do so unless we put the duty so high that it would cost them too much to dump here.

Mr. BORAH. We are not doing that.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I would like to do it.

Mr. BORAH. I know; but we are not going to do it. You do not claim that the figures which are offered, either by the House or by the Senate committee, would be so high as to prevent them from controlling the market?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; they could still sacrifice their sugar, with the motive of controlling the market.

Mr. BORAH. How are we going to afford any protection against them except by a repeal of the differential?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I favor that. I want to show what this differential has cost this country. I will divert to that, because it is so important. I refer to reports which have been obtained recently, within the last month, beginning with 1904, and winding up with 1927, which is the latest report they have, showing trade balances between the United States and its insular possessions, and between the United States and Cuba, since the adoption of the reciprocity treaty of 1903. Here is the column for Cuba. In 1904 the balance of trade in favor of Cuba was \$49,000,000. I will read only the millions. In 1905 it was forty-seven million. In 1906 it was thirty-seven million. In 1907 it was forty-eight million. In 1908 it was thirty-six million. In 1909 it was fifty-nine million. In 1910 it was seventy million. In 1911 it was forty-nine million. In 1912 it was fifty-seven million. In 1913 it was fifty-five million. In 1914 it was sixty-two million. In 1915 it was one hundred and ten million. In 1916 it was one hundred and one million. In 1917 it was fifty-two million. In 1918 it was fifty-one million. In 1919 it was one hundred and forty million. In 1920 it was two hundred and six million. In 1921 it was forty-two million. In 1922 it was one hundred and thirty-nine million. In 1923 it was one hundred and eighty-four million. In 1924 it was one hundred and sixty-one million. In 1925 it was sixty-three million. In 1926 it was ninety million. In 1927 it was one hundred and one million. That makes a total of \$2,019,681,086. We are granting those people concessions in our relations with them, and here is what it has cost us to do it. There are three and a half million people in Cuba. I have divided that \$2,000,000,000 into the three and a half million population of Cuba, and that indicates that we have made a present to every individual in Cuba, in the 24 years, of \$571.42.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. That would be a humanitarian enterprise upon the part of the United States if that \$571 went to all the individuals.

Mr. BROUSSARD. It does not.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator knows it goes to a very limited number.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I know that.

Mr. BORAH. And most of those are American citizens.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes; it comes right here, and that amounts to \$23.809 per year per capita in Cuba, using this method of illustrating the cost to America.

Let me refer now to some figures as to the present duty. I have figured the matter out. I do not think anybody will dispute these figures, and I have made these statements in order to have them challenged if anybody can challenge them. I have the figures to prove that the individual per capita consumption of sugar in the United States is 30 pounds. The proposed House rate is 2.40 cents per pound. The present rate is 1.0176 per pound. The raise under the House bill would be

0.064 of 1 cent. Thirty pounds would mean a raise per individual of 19.2 cents per year.

I have statistics to show that the average family in the United States consists of five members, and if we multiply the figure I have just given by five, the raise per family under the House bill would be 96 cents. But my friend the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to-morrow will take 2.20 or 2.40, and will multiply that by the number of pounds imported from Cuba, and say that is what it costs the American people. Of course, that would be equivalent to advocating a repeal of the sugar duty altogether.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it seems to me that the producer of sugar in the United States is deeply interested in two propositions: First, the matter of our relations with Cuba, and, second, the matter of our relations with the Philippines. Cuba, with her immense production, under the advantage she has, may supply the market of the United States, may she not?

Mr. BROUSSARD. She can do so easily.

Mr. BORAH. In view of the fact that Cuba can produce sugar cheaper than it is possible for us to produce sugar in the United States, how is it going to be practically possible to protect the producer of sugar in the United States, with this differential in favor of Cuba?

Mr. BROUSSARD. We can not do it. I am sure that we ought to repeal that, or, if we do not, if we wish to discontinue the monopoly of the American sugar market in favor of the Cubans, we can still do that if we raise the duty sufficiently to protect us. In other words, we must make it 20 per cent higher than we would make it otherwise.

Mr. BORAH. It is not practically possible to raise the duty sufficiently high in this country to prevent Cuba from controlling our market in sugar.

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; they will control.

Mr. BORAH. On the other hand, coming in on the other side of the continent is the Philippine sugar. There is just one question that interests me in this whole discussion, and that is how—even levying this duty which we are proposing, either the House provision or the Senate committee provision—are we going to avail anything to the American producer against that situation?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I will say to the Senator that I am quite in accord with him as to the abrogation of the treaty with Cuba. I can illustrate to the Senator just how they got the best of us in that convention. I want to illustrate that with one product raised in my own State, namely, rice. We ought to control the market in Cuba for certain rice which they buy from Asia, which the American people will not usually buy. They put their duty on rice so low that even after giving us 30 per cent preferential we get no benefit at all. The margin is so small that there is no inducement for a merchant there to take the American rice. The difference is so trifling that it is infinitesimal when it is figured out. But the 20 per cent on sugar from Cuba amounts to millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. BORAH. There might have been good reason for giving the advantage to Cuba at the time we did it, but certainly conditions have changed so that even if it was justified at that time, the question is, Can it be justified now?

Mr. BROUSSARD. It is not justified now, and, as I have said, I think that we ought to repeal it. In the meantime, as long as that is not done, the Senator will concede that if we raise that duty from \$1.76 to \$2.20, the Cubans can not sell sugar in New York to-day under the rate of \$2.20 at the same price at which they could sell with the duty \$1.76. They would have to disburse an additional amount in the form of duty into the Treasury of the United States in order to import it.

Mr. BORAH. Of course they would, but they have the sugar, and they have nothing else in the world to do with it; they have practically no place else to sell it. Rather than permit the sugar to remain a drug on the market, why would they not dump it in the United States, even though they received less profit if they did so?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think they are dumping now, but I would like to make them pay more for dumping. They have been dumping for the last eight months.

Under the Senate committee rate of \$2.20, there is a difference of $4\frac{1}{2}$ mills per pound, and for 30 pounds the difference would be 13.2 cents per individual, or 56 cents per family of five. That is all it would cost the American people. Nobody can figure otherwise. Nobody will contend that people are going to get their condensed milk cheaper if we raise the duty on sugar 0.44 of a mill. The fellow who takes that sugar sells it in the shape of condensed milk for nearly three times the price that he pays for the sugar. And so it is with the gum, so it is with confectionary, candy, ice cream, fruits put up, and all sorts of things. That plays no figure. If we put the duty at

10 cents a pound, the Coca-Cola Co. should not change its price, nor should Hershey change the price of his chocolate.

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I yield.

Mr. WATERMAN. Does the Senator think that the Cuban producers can continue to ship sugar to the United States and pay 44 cents per hundred pounds more duty than they are paying now? In other words, are not the Cubans selling sugar today practically below cost, on an average, in Cuba, when they are selling it for \$1.90 a hundred pounds, cost and freight, in New York? If they have to pay 44 cents more, it will reduce it down 44 cents below \$1.90, and can they subsist longer at that rate?

Mr. BROUSSARD. I do not believe that they will subsist long if they continue doing that. My own conclusion about the American-Cuban interests is that they have been making a drive during the last year, and probably a little longer. It is a question with them of the survival of the fittest. We have the weapon to protect ourselves. We can protect ourselves against Cuban sugar. Brazil has a duty of 17 cents. Even if we raise our duty to 2.40 cents, there would not be a single civilized country in the world having as low a rate. We can protect ourselves, but we are not doing it. We are not doing it because certain large interests in New York, with \$1,500,000,000 invested in Cuba, are flooding our country with misinformation and propaganda and prejudice against the one industry.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] asked the question. I do not know whether they could afford to sell it or not, but there are those who have studied the question who think they would be able to do so. They would certainly realize less profit, but still be able to send it to this country and practically control our market. In the meantime we would be putting an extra heavy burden upon our own people.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I do not know about that. If they are going to absorb that tariff, as the Senator contends—

Mr. BORAH. Yes; part of it at least.

Mr. BROUSSARD. And still sell their sugar? If they absorb it we will not have to pay any more for our sugar.

Mr. BORAH. No; whatever they absorb we will not have to pay, but, of course, it will be divided, in my judgment, as those things generally are. They will not absorb it all.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The lowest figure for which the Cuban people can make sugar is a little under 1.5 cents a pound. When they have to pay that to produce it and then pay freight and insurance, and then a duty of 2.2 cents a pound, and if they are made to understand that that duty is going to be applied for the next seven or eight years, I am sure they will be sensible enough to understand that they have got to retrench. They have their sugar and they must sell it, but they would not plant such a great acreage in the future with a duty of 2.4 or 2.2 cents staring them in the face.

Mr. BORAH. I think the difference in labor alone would make up the difference in cost.

Mr. BROUSSARD. But many people do not understand this feature of it. It is not like a corn crop or a wheat crop. The sugarcane is planted, and it is there and growing, and it has to be taken care of. It is good in Cuba for 12 or 15 years. They can not reduce their cultivated area year in and year out without great loss. The increase is very slow. They are producing now over 5,000,000 tons of sugar. They grind the cane and convert it into sugar, which is a drug on the market now because all other countries have shut their doors against them. They come here, and, of course, if they have too much sugar and it costs them more to sell to other countries than it does to us, even at the price they have to take here, they prefer to sell it here because they are preventing competition in this, the best market for them in the world. They have a selfish motive in trying to discourage an increase in production here.

I wish to say frankly that in Louisiana since we got the new varieties of cane, on one-half the acreage we formerly had we are producing over 200,000 tons of sugar in 1929 by means of a cane which has resisted the diseases we have heretofore had, and we are getting more sugar to a ton of sucrose and more tonnage to the acre. The prospects are good. The cane stands the climate better than the old stock that we have had, so that we can expand and Florida can expand, and I think we can increase our production.

I think it is a very foolish policy for the Government to pursue to put domestic sugar producers out of business and make us entirely dependent upon Cuba for this main staple food product that is so necessary to every nation, our own included. Other countries like England, in addition to a higher rate of duty than has been proposed here, give a bounty to encourage the people to cultivate and raise the sugarcane.

Mr. BORAH. We are paying a bounty to Cuba; at least that is the effect of it.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Yes; and a very, very high bounty. I would like very much to join with the Senator in an effort to repeal it. I stated while the Senator was absent a while ago that I am so anxious to solve the Philippine question that I am entertaining the thought of proposing to limit them as they were limited before as to the quantity of sugar they may ship in here. May I repeat, if the Senator is interested in that question and for the benefit of others who were not here at the time, that there was no demand on the part of the Filipinos for the repeal of the 300,000-ton limitation on sugar. The Filipinos never protested against it. When the act of 1913 was passed, for the first time in the history of the country in the Underwood law we adopted a policy of putting sugar on the free list in three years beginning in 1916. Therefore, having adopted that policy, we were not going to permit this limitation on Philippine sugar because all the world was to ship sugar over here free of duty. Therefore the limitation on Philippine sugar was repealed. The Filipinos never asked for it. The American people never asked for it, but that was the policy which was then adopted.

In 1914 Congress changed its mind about free sugar and repealed that provision which provided for free sugar two years later, and adopted a duty of 1.004. That was the duty under the Underwood Act. But Congress forgot to reinstate the limitation on Philippine sugar. It was merely an oversight. I never realized it until they began to increase the shipments of sugar here, and when we did realize it they had exceeded the 300,000 tons. I do not know why we can not put on a limitation now. That was the original act which established the policy between this Government and the Philippines, acquiesced in by them, providing that they were to be limited in the importation of sugar into this country.

I am seriously thinking of offering such a proposal to see if the Senate will not vote to do something to protect us against Philippine sugar. The other plan is just as effective because if we are going to consider the granting of independence to the Philippines and that question is to be considered by this Congress, I do not believe there will be any increase in the production of sugar in the Philippines until such time as that question shall have been determined.

Mr. BORAH. Did the Senator say he sees no possible increase in the production of sugar in the Philippines?

Mr. BROUSSARD. No; I see no possibility for an increase because of the fact that capital would not go there. I do not mean to say they can not produce more sugar, because they can; but I see no possibility of an increase because capital will not go there.

Mr. President, I do not want to prolong the discussion of this matter, but I want to read the summary of the report made by all six of the members of the Tariff Commission on the question of whether or not the increase in the rate of duty in 1922 had affected the rise of the price of sugar in 1923, in January and February. The commission said:

In the judgment of the commission, this report leads to the following conclusions:

1. The increase in sugar prices, which began toward the end of January, 1923, carrying the price of raw sugar, f. o. b. Cuba, from 3.165 cents on January 24, to 4 cents on February 9, 5.10 cents on February 20, 5.60 cents on March 4, and 5.85 cents on April 10; and the price of granulated sugar from 6.47 cents on January 31 to 7.15 cents on February 9, 8.58 cents on February 3, 9.11 cents on March 14, and 9.21 cents on April 12, was due to causes not connected with the American tariff. On the rapidly rising sugar market in the United States, which was witnessed after January 27 of this year, price factors other than the tariff have been controlling.

3. The statement that the American price of sugar for the time being includes the duty on sugar is not equivalent to saying that if the tariff were reduced or removed, prices to the consumer would necessarily be lowered by the full amount of the reduction. If the American sugar tariff were reduced or removed, the tendency would be to reduce the domestic production of sugar and to increase the importation of foreign sugar into the United States.

Those are the conclusions unanimously arrived at by the Tariff Commission to the effect that the increase in the tariff on sugar does not necessarily cause an increase in the price of sugar to the consumer. I have already produced another authority on this point.

Mr. President, at this point I shall conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	Keyes	Shortridge
Ashurst	George	King	Simmons
Baird	Gillett	McCulloch	Smith
Bingham	Glass	McKellar	Smoot
Black	Goff	McMaster	Steiner
Blaine	Gould	McNary	Sullivan
Bleasde	Greene	Metcalf	Swanson
Borah	Grundy	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Hale	Norbeck	Townsend
Brock	Harris	Norris	Trammell
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Tydings
Broussard	Hatfield	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Hawes	Overman	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	Patterson	Walcott
Copeland	Hebert	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Pittman	Waterman
Deneen	Johnson	Ransdell	Watson
Dill	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Fess	Kean	Schall	
Fletcher	Kendrick	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood there were one or two Senators who were going to speak to-day on the pending question. May I ask the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN] does he intend to speak?

Mr. WATERMAN. I may do so at a later time, but I do not desire to speak now.

Mr. HARRISON. Perhaps I had better suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President, as I thought some Senator was going to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator from Mississippi that we have just had a quorum call.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi is not prepared to go on at this moment, I shall occupy the floor for a while, although I should prefer to wait until later to speak upon the subject. I am, however, prepared to speak now.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall take a little more time in discussing the sugar schedule than I have devoted to some other schedules; not because of partiality, although the beet-sugar industry is a very important factor in the welfare of my State and of the West generally, but because the sugar schedule has unjustifiably received the brunt of criticism during the pendency of the tariff bill and during the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

THE CONSUMER AND THE SUGAR TARIFF

There is no just reason why the proposed increase in the import duty on sugar should be singled out for attack, because that commodity is cheaper to-day than it has been for many years; in fact, it is about the cheapest food one can buy. To-day the housewife is paying but little more for sugar than she paid in pre-war days, while the price of all other food products has increased more than 50 per cent. Had sugar prices increased in the same proportion as other prices, sugar would be selling for more than 2 cents a pound higher than it is to-day.

It may be interesting at this point to compare the marketing and the selling price of sugar with that of some other commodities. In the culture of the sugar beets and in the manufacture of sugar therefrom the highest type of scientific and technical skill is involved from the time the seed is planted until the sugar is sacked. The manufacturing process alone requires the erection of a mill at a cost of from three-quarters of a million dollars to three million dollars, and the product is often shipped thousands of miles to market. Notwithstanding this, according to the United States Department of Labor, the retail price of sugar is less than half the price of navy beans, which require but little cultivation and go through no process of manufacture. I could give a list of hundreds of other agricultural products as to which the same thing may be said.

Again, the price of sugar is certainly less than the price of a pint of milk which is now taken from the humble "bossie" by machinery and shipped but a few miles into the city, with very little labor and expense. These comparisons might be carried on ad infinitum, but I believe those cited will suffice to convince any fair-minded man or woman that the consumer will have no just cause for complaint if the price of sugar shall be increased a fraction of a cent by the proposed increase in the tariff.

The increase recommended by the committee over the existing rate is 44 cents a hundred pounds. As the per capita consumption of sugar, excluding that used in the manufactured products having an established standard price, is about 60 pounds per annum, the additional cost to the consumer would

not exceed 26 cents a year, provided the full increase were reflected in the retail price. This, however, is extremely doubtful. But if this small increase in the price to the consumer should occur by reason of the increased tariff, it would be offset by the advantage of maintaining an adequate domestic sugar supply as an insurance against unduly high sugar prices.

Foreign sugar is capable of price control, and, as has been demonstrated in the past, foreign sugar producers, and even Americans with money invested in a foreign-sugar industry, have had no hesitancy in gouging the American consumers out of hundreds of millions of dollars when, after the domestic crop has been exhausted, they had temporarily complete control of our market. Innumerable instances might be cited where the domestic beet-sugar crop, coming on to the market at an opportune time, has played an important part in saving American consumers from extortionate prices or in compelling foreign sugar producers to sell their product at reasonable prices in competition with the domestic product. I will, however, cite but two instances which are illustrative.

DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY AN INSURANCE AGAINST UNREASONABLY HIGH PRICES

In the summer of 1917 the Food Administration conducted a careful survey of the sugar situation in this country, which disclosed the fact that sugar stocks were at a low ebb, that months would elapse before the new cane crop would become available, and that the only immediate source of supply of any magnitude was domestic beet sugar, which was due on the market about the 1st of October of that year. This meant that, if left to the law of supply and demand, sugar prices during the last three months of the year would have risen to unprecedented heights. Having no power to fix the prices, the only course open to the Food Administration was to appeal to the domestic sugar producers to forego the large profits which could have been secured by taking advantage of the market situation. These producers met the appeal in a patriotic spirit by entering into an agreement with the Food Administration to charge not to exceed 7½ cents a pound for their forthcoming crop, estimated at between 800,000 and a million tons. The price agreed upon was 1½ cents below the then prevailing price of imported cane sugar.

The effect of this action is set forth in an official statement by the Hon. Herbert Hoover, then at the head of the Food Administration, in the New York Times of August 27, 1917, in which he said:

The beet-sugar producers of the country have patriotically agreed with the Food Administration to limit the price of their sugar to a basis which should result in a reduction of about 1½ cents per pound from the present price, effecting a saving of \$30,000,000 to the consuming public between now and the first of the year. This patriotic action of the domestic beet-sugar industry in acting as a control over the price demanded for imported sugar will not only make the saving mentioned above between now and the end of the year but will contribute largely to establish a lower price for imported sugar throughout the year.

What the price of sugar would have been at that time, had it not been for the stabilizing influence of the domestic crop, can be assumed by the citation of another illustration which occurred in 1920.

Every housewife will long remember the so-called "sugar debauch" of that year, when the Cuban sugar interests raised their raw sugar prices from 5½ to 23½ cents per pound within a few months, compelling her to pay 30 cents a pound for this necessary commodity. Not content with thus mulcting our people out of hundreds of millions of dollars by this unwarranted rise in price, the Cubans held back their sugars for even higher prices. It was reported in the press at the time that they had formed a pool to hold back some 400,000 or 500,000 tons of sugar until a price of 30 cents a pound for raw sugar could be obtained.

This reprehensible conduct on the part of Cuba was made possible only after the domestic beet and cane crop had become exhausted. In that one year we paid Cuban sugar planters over \$660,000,000 for sugar which was worth considerably less than half that amount. What will happen if the American production of sugar ceases? Why, this is only a test of what will happen. This sum was more than sufficient to erect enough beet-sugar factories in this country to supply our entire requirements. This levy, placed upon American consumers by the Cubans when they had them at their mercy, was greater than the duty collected on all sugar imported in the following five years.

As far as the interest of the American consumer is concerned, comparing the action of the Cuban sugar industry with that of the American beet-sugar industry, I ask in whose hands is that interest safer? Is it safer in the hands of a foreign industry, controlled by a small group of financially powerful Americans, ready whenever the opportunity presents itself to gouge the

American people out of hundreds of millions of dollars; or is it safer in the hands of Americans who have invested their money in an American industry, which gives employment to American labor and American farmers, distributes its earnings among American industries, pays Federal, State, and local taxes, and which can be relied upon at all times to deal fairly with the American people?

NEED OF ADEQUATE TARIFF

Cuba can produce sugar at a lower cost than almost any other country in the world, and without adequate tariff protection it will be only a matter of a short time before the domestic industry is a matter of history. Therefore, unless an increase in the tariff on Cuban sugar is granted by Congress, there is little doubt that the domestic industry must surrender to this foreign industry which is being exploited by a handful of Americans. The hundred and odd American beet-sugar factories will go on the scrap heap; the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in the industry will be wiped out. Hundreds of thousands of acres of farm lands now devoted to sugar-beet culture will be diverted to the growing of other crops which are already surfeiting the market. Hundreds of thousands of farmers will be deprived of a remunerative, cash-paying crop. Hundreds of prosperous farming communities which owe their prosperity to the establishment of beet-sugar factories in their midst will be deprived of these benefits. Do the American people want to bring about this result? Do they want to abandon a great American industry, producing a necessary food commodity, in order that a foreign industry and a handful of Americans who have their money invested in that industry may exploit a foreign people, and gain control of the American market for one of the important necessities of life?

AMERICAN CAPITAL INVESTED IN THE CUBAN SUGAR INDUSTRY

In opposing an increase in the duty on sugar, great financial interests in Wall Street in their propaganda stress the fact that they have nearly a billion dollars invested in the Cuban sugar industry, and that such increase would be detrimental to these foreign investments.

Mr. President, while I do not contend that American capital invested in a foreign country should not receive consideration by our Government, I do contend that money invested in this country, bearing its share of the tax burden, and the turnover of which enriches American farmers and American industry, should receive first consideration. American capital invested in a foreign country should be protected—and that invested in the Cuban sugar industry is protected by a 20 per cent tariff preferential—but when American capital so invested is employed in exploiting an industry which, by reason of cheap labor and low costs of production, is able to flood this country with a cheap commodity, tending either to reduce the wage and living standards of Americans to those of a tropical country, or cause the annihilation of a great American industry, such capital, in my opinion, should receive the same treatment as other capital invested in that country.

OUR EXPORT TRADE WITH CUBA

It is claimed by the opponents of an increase in the duty on sugar that it will reduce the purchasing power of Cuba, and therefore curtail her purchases in the United States. This statement is fallacious, and is put forth with the idea of enlisting the aid of American business men in opposing the proposed increase. But, Mr. President, I do not believe they will be misled by this subtle propaganda.

The United States is the very best market in the world. We have a greater purchasing power than that of any nation. Wages are higher here than anywhere else in the world. High wages mean a better standard of living, and a better standard of living means increased purchases not only of necessities but of comforts and luxuries. If this is true, which I believe will be conceded, why should we follow the will-o'-the-wisp of a slight increase in our export trade when we have the best markets within our own borders?

It is both legitimate and laudable to seek to expand our export trade, but when, in those efforts, we seek to barter the life of a great American industry in return for a slight increase in our foreign business, it is unpatriotic, unbusinesslike, and un-American. If, in order to secure some slight increase in our trade with Cuba, we have to adopt a tariff policy which will practically destroy the domestic sugar industry, which now spends hundreds of millions of dollars a year in the purchase of a farm crop, automobiles, machinery, structural steel, farm implements, coal, coke, limerock, burlap, chemicals, and dozens of other supplies purchased of American concerns, the question naturally arises, "Is the game worth the candle?"

OUR DEBT TO CUBA

Great banking interests with money invested in the Cuban sugar industry are appealing to public sentiment by alleging

that we are under obligation to Cuba, and that an increase in the duty on sugar is a violation of such obligation. Every Senator, no doubt, has received those statements that have been broadcast all over the United States, sent into every home, into every business house, and displayed on the street corners.

Let us review briefly the relations existing between the two countries during the past 30 years, and ascertain on which side an obligation rests.

In 1898 the United States spent the blood of its youth and the wealth of the Nation to release Cuba from the yoke of Spanish oppression and tyranny, under which her people had suffered for centuries. After we secured for Cuba her freedom from Spanish oppression, we sent our best brains to the island and established a stable government based upon the principles on which our own Government was founded. We sent our Army to Cuba to maintain order until such time as her citizens were able to take over the reins of government. We sent Gen. Leonard Wood and his associates to the island, and through their efforts the country was relieved from the scourge of pestilence and infection, and a condition brought about which made Cuba in reality, as well as in name, the "Pearl of the Antilles."

Having done this, our Government entered into a commercial agreement with Cuba by which the products of each country should enter the ports of the other at preferential rates ranging from 20 to 40 per cent. A roseate picture was painted by the Cubans regarding the great advantages which would accrue to the United States by such a treaty; but, Mr. President, looking back over a period of 30 years, we find that under these reciprocal arrangements the balance of trade in favor of Cuba has been over \$2,000,000,000, or practically twice the balance of trade in favor of all our insular possessions.

By reason of this reciprocity treaty the tariff rebate granted on Cuban sugar entering our ports has amounted to over \$300,000,000, with a consequent loss to the United States Treasury.

In 1903 those interested in the Cuban sugar industry assured Congress that Cuba could not possibly produce to exceed two and one-half million tons of sugar and that her sole desire was to produce only enough of that commodity to supply the gap between American production and consumption. Every Senator who was here at the time remembers well how that was rung through the Chamber. All the press of the country gave it to the American people. That is what we had in view. What is the result?

At the time the reciprocity treaty was ratified Cuba was producing less than a million tons of sugar, while this year she is producing nearly five and a quarter million tons, or enough to supply over 80 per cent of the entire consumption of the United States. Due to these concessions to Cuba, which have resulted in dumping millions of tons of sugar on the American market at a very low cost, the domestic sugar industry has languished and to-day is threatened with annihilation.

In the light of this, I hold that it is the height of temerity for the Cubans or Americans with money invested in the Cuban industry to claim that we are lax in our moral obligation to Cuba if we increase the duty on her sugar.

AN INCREASE IN TARIFF NOT DETRIMENTAL TO CUBA

Of the 6,000,000 short tons of sugar consumed in the United States, Cuba supplies nearly 50 per cent. Only a little over one-half of 1 per cent comes in from other duty-paying countries.

The United States is the largest consumer of sugar in the world and surely a foreign country such as Cuba can have no just grievances when under our present tariff relations she not only has shut out practically all other foreign sugars from entering our markets but supplies us with approximately 50 per cent of our entire consumption.

The American-Cuban sugar interests are raising a hue and cry to the effect that the proposed increase in the duty on sugar will work a hardship on the Cuban industry. This same hue and cry was raised by these interests before the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Act, which increased the duty on Cuban sugar from 1.60 to 1.76 cents per pound, and yet Cuba increased her production over 40 per cent in the two years succeeding the passage of that act and to-day is producing approximately a million and a half short tons more than she did before the rate was increased. I think it will be conceded by everyone that an industry which increases its production over 40 per cent in two years did not suffer a very great injury by the passage of the act of 1922, nor will it suffer an injury if the proposed rates are put into effect.

The claims of the American-Cuban sugar interests are so contradictory in many instances as to make them ridiculous. Every Senator in this Chamber has been the recipient of propaganda from these interests and many of you will recall the statement frequently made that an increase in the tariff on sugar would

be an excessive burden upon the American consumer and at other times we have been told by the same parties that such an increase would injure Cuba. They blow hot and cold with the same breath. If the increase in the sugar tariff is passed on to the American consumer it can not injure Cuba. On the other hand, if Cuba is compelled to pay the increased duty, it can not be a burden on American consumers.

It can not be both. One is false or the other is false. They can not ride one horse going in opposite directions.

CAUSE OF PRESENT DEMORALIZATION IN DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. President, to-day the domestic sugar industry is in a demoralized condition unprecedented in its history. Nineteen beet-sugar companies, with an average invested capital of more than \$189,000,000, earned an average of only 3.37 per cent a year in the decade from 1919 to 1929. Eighteen companies, with an investment of more than \$127,000,000, earned an average of only 0.52 of 1 per cent. In 2 of the 10 years all companies lost money—lots of it. In 3 years of the 10 all but one company were "in the red." Nine of the 19 companies reported a net loss on their operations during the past 10 years. The net income for the remaining 10 was extremely small. Nineteen companies averaged 5.33 per cent on their capital stock for 10 years. Eighteen companies averaged only 0.73 of 1 per cent.

This condition has been brought about not through any fault or mismanagement of the sugar companies but by overproduction of sugar in Cuba. This overproduction is largely the result of the exploitation of the Cuban sugar industry by American capitalists. But these capitalists attempt to mislead the public into the belief that the large increase in the sugar production of that island is the result of an appeal during the war to "produce more sugar for the Allies." This contention, however, is not borne out by the facts.

The Cuban crop of 1914 was 2,597,000 long tons. From 1914 to 1923, a period embracing several postwar years, the crop increased to 3,603,000 tons, or approximately a million tons in nine years. From 1923 to 1925 the crop increased to 5,125,970 tons, or one and one-half million tons in two years, and this five years after the close of the war. It is apparent from the above comparisons that Cuba's overproduction is not due to any urge on the part of our Government to produce more sugar for the Allies but, as stated before, is the result of the exploitation of the Cuban industry by American capital.

SHOULD WE BUY CUBAN SUGAR BECAUSE IT IS CHEAP?

It is argued that we should purchase our sugar from Cuba because that country can produce so much cheaper than the United States—an application of the ancient, now worn-out, free-trade theory of buying in the cheapest market. If this program was followed, we would buy all our wheat and beef from the Argentine, our wool from Australia, our shoes from Czechoslovakia, our eggs from China, our peanuts and rice from Japan, our beans, tomatoes, and onions from Mexico, our figs from Smyrna, our cotton from India, our butter from Denmark, our cheese from Italy, our peas from Canada, our nuts from Italy, our cutlery from Great Britain, and so on down the line.

With the exception of some few commodities which we produce cheaper than foreign countries and yet are able to maintain the American standard of living, foreign costs are much lower than ours; hence the need of a protective tariff. Our economic policies have demonstrated their soundness. How much more serious would be the farm problem to-day if we bought agricultural products from other countries merely because they were cheap? Could American industry prosper if we bought manufactured products from other countries merely because they were cheap? I think not. If we pursued such a program, industry would find itself in a precarious condition—the same precarious condition in which the domestic sugar industry finds itself because Cuba is dumping her low-cost sugar on the American market in competition with the domestic product. Mr. President, I can not believe that this argument will be given any serious consideration by fair-minded men of this body.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY

It has been contended that because of the relatively small number of farmers engaged in sugar-beet culture compared to our total population it would be an imposition on the consumer to increase the sugar duty. The answer to this argument is found in a true knowledge of conditions in the domestic industry.

There are approximately 100,000 farmers engaged in sugar-beet culture, employing seasonally from 60,000 to 80,000 farm laborers. With an average of 4 to a family, we have, therefore, 600,000 or 700,000 of our farm population whose welfare

is directly affected by the domestic beet-sugar industry. In addition, there are some 35,000 employees in and around the factories whose families are dependent upon that industry for a livelihood.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does the Senator know of any agricultural crop raised in the United States, other than the sugar-beet crop, the price of which is guaranteed in advance of production?

Mr. SMOOT. That practice obtained during the war and following the war.

Mr. KENDRICK. That practice is pursued to-day. The producers of sugar beets are guaranteed in advance the price for their crop, and, in addition to that, they are given a participating benefit when the beets are manufactured into sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us take Michigan, for instance. The contract with the beet grower in Michigan this year gave him \$7.75 a ton for his beets, and then, if there is any money made by the company, it is divided between the producer of sugar and the raiser of beets.

In Idaho the rate in the northern section of the State is \$7.50 a ton for beets. They get \$7.50 a ton no matter whether the company loses money or not. But if the company makes money then half of it goes to the man who raises the beets. There is no other commodity raised in the United States on such terms and under such conditions. I think it is right; I think it is proper. I believe in that kind of cooperation between the man who raises the beets from the ground and the men who put the money into the factory to make the beets into sugar. I believe that every farmer who is now raising beets has come to the conclusion that there is a community of interest. We can not affect one without affecting the other. That is why every Senator and every Congressman receives petitions from the farm organizations throughout the country asking for this increase—and not only that but a still greater increase than the committee granted.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does the Senator know of any other agricultural crop which brings more direct and widespread benefit to the community in which it is produced than do sugar beets?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not. There is not a farm product produced that brings more richness back to the soil than do sugar beets. Land on which wheat has been raised for years and years gets weaker and weaker every year unless it is replenished with the richest of fertilizer. But take a given quantity of that wheat land and plant beets upon it one year and let the leaves and the topplings of the beets remain on the ground, and that land is fertilized at once. It is the best fertilizer that can be put upon the ground. Germany learned that lesson very early. That is why foreign countries now use that process of fertilization to bring back life to the land that has been worn out by a constant raising of one class of crops.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. There is one question which I would like to have the Senator explain to us, and that is why it is that the manufacturers of beet sugar in my home State and all the surrounding States where sugar beets are grown and beet sugar is produced, do not sell the sugar cheaper in the community where it is produced than they do elsewhere? For instance, in the city of Billings, Mont., we pay exactly the same for the sugar that is manufactured there that we pay for the sugar that is shipped in from the Atlantic coast or the Pacific coast. It seems to me that is extremely unfair to the people in the community where the sugar is actually manufactured.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I can explain that to the Senator in such a way that he will understand it. If the sugar produced in the intermountain country, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, and Montana, was all consumed in those States then there would be an objection to that basis of charge. But of all the sugar produced in Utah, we consume less than 10 per cent of the amount locally. In other words, 90 per cent of that sugar goes to Chicago and similar territory. We can not consume it in Utah.

Why did we begin the manufacture of sugar in the first place? It is the one commodity where the raw product could be condensed into the lowest possible percentage in the form of the finished product. That was wonderfully demonstrated back in 1850 before I was born.

If Senators will go now about 5 miles from Salt Lake City to a place called Sugar House Ward, they will find an old adobe sugar mill that my father built there in the early fifties. The machinery was brought from Paris. It came up the Mississippi River. Every ounce of it was hauled there by ox teams through a country entirely uninhabited and almost a thousand miles from everywhere. They did the best they could with the machinery obtainable in that day. France was the only place where such machinery could be found. They began the making of sugar there. Why did they go into it in the beginning and then in later years establish the industry as an industry? It was because we could not pay the freight rates on the wheat to Chicago and the other markets and sell our wheat at a profit. What was the best thing to do? We had to find a commodity the finished product of which we could ship and which would represent only a small percentage of the raw material out of which it was made.

Mr. WHEELER. But that does not answer my question.

Mr. SMOOT. I am coming to the answer to the Senator's question. What do we find to-day? As I have already stated, 90 per cent of all the sugar produced in the States of Idaho and Utah must find a market elsewhere, and the great market for that sugar is at the Mississippi River and in Chicago. With 90 per cent of our product we find ourselves under the necessity of coming in direct competition with Cuban sugar which they are shipping up the Mississippi River now at a freight rate less than one-half of what we have to pay from Salt Lake City to Chicago. We are not only in competition with the local mills of Michigan and other parts of the United States but we are in direct competition with Cuban sugar, and the freight rates are against us. We have to sell our sugar there. There is no question about the necessity for selling it there, and we have to take existing the price there and meet Cuban competition, and it is taking the blood and life out of the industry to do it.

Mr. WHEELER. But that does not seem to me to answer my question at all. For instance, in the city of Billings, a city of 15,000 or 20,000 population, sugar is manufactured from the beets which are taken from the fields near by. They do not have any freight rate to pay either on the beets or on the manufactured sugar. Why should they not give the Western States, where the raw material is produced and the sugar manufactured, the benefit of a lower price? Instead of that the Great Western Sugar Co. and all the other sugar companies charge the people of that city the cost price of the sugar plus the freight from Chicago plus their profit on the sugar, whatever it is, although the sugar is not shipped by freight at all, but is consumed right where it is made. It seems to me that is absolutely untenable and can not be justified.

Mr. SMOOT. But we have to take the picture as a whole. If they did that, where would they make any money?

Mr. WHEELER. In other words, and there is no dispute about it, the Great Western Sugar Co. is paying good dividends and making very good profits. They have been making money and there is no question about it. Why could not the Great Western Sugar Co. sell sugar in the city of Billings, right where it is produced and manufactured, at a lower price than they sell it, say, in Omaha, or elsewhere in the East? It would not hurt their profits at all because of the fact that they are making such big profits.

Mr. SMOOT. The Great Western Sugar Co., as I have already stated, is located in perhaps the best place in the United States for a sugar factory. Their great market for sugar is Omaha and other towns in the West. We have to ship our sugar right past their market. That is their home market. They do not ship the percentage of sugar east to Chicago where the other factories are compelled to ship and meet the competition from Cuba. We have to do it from Utah. If we do not manufacture that sugar there and if we do not make something on the sugar that is sold there—and it is sold to them just as cheap as if the sugar were produced in Chicago and freight paid on it from Chicago to Utah—then we could not make anything at all.

Mr. WHEELER. They sell it, of course, as cheap as if they had purchased Cuban sugar and shipped it in there.

Mr. SMOOT. If we stop the manufacture of sugar there, then our people in Utah and surrounding States will pay even more for their sugar.

Mr. WHEELER. They would not pay a bit more because of the fact that they are paying identically the same price now that they would have to pay and did pay before ever there was a sugar manufactory located in Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. That situation is true as to every manufactured article. When I was manufacturing woolen goods the people at the mill paid the same price that was paid in Chicago. Here, for instance, is the United States Steel Corporation. They are making steel at Provo, Utah. Does the Senator think they

sell that steel any cheaper at Provo than they would if they shipped it there from one of their mills in the East?

Mr. WHEELER. There is no reason in the world why they could not and should not give the people of Utah and Montana the benefit of it, because of the fact that they always claim that they had to pay the freight rate on their product when it is shipped elsewhere; but when they sell it locally and do not have to pay the freight rate they ought to give the people of the community the benefit of that saving.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure they are struggling along to live, and I know they are not getting very much out of the business.

Mr. WHEELER. Surely the Great Western Sugar Co. is not struggling along to live. I am perfectly willing to agree that the sugar people do the same thing that other manufacturers do. As a matter of fact the oil companies are charging the people of our State more for oil produced right there than they are charging for the same oil in States where they have to ship it a long distance and pay the transportation charges.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, because of the beneficial effect of sugar-beet culture upon the productivity of the soil the sugar beet is an important factor in the cycle of rotation. As a general farm practice, sugar beets are planted on the same land only one year in four. The average acreage devoted to sugar beets during the past five years has been 700,000 acres. Therefore in the general scheme of agriculture in the beet-growing sections we may say that millions of acres of farm lands are affected by beet culture.

As an illustration of the importance of the beet-sugar industry to American farmers it may be stated that since 1900 they have received over \$1,000,000,000 for the beet crops, or an average of \$36,000,000 annually, while during the past five years the average annual receipts for this crop have amounted to over \$56,000,000. In addition to this amount paid to the farmers annually, the domestic beet-sugar industry produces a farm crop from American soil valued at over \$120,000,000, the proceeds from the sale of which are all distributed to American farmers, American labor, and American industry. It pays annually to the railroads every year from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000; it pays annually in salaries and wages over \$20,000,000, and a like sum is annually expended for supplies, such as machinery, coal, coke, limrock, bags, chemicals, and so forth, all products of American industry.

In addition to the domestic beet-sugar industry we have also the Louisiana cane-sugar industry, the corn-sugar industry, and the sugar industries of Hawaii and Porto Rico, whose annual disbursements, if added to the above figures, would aggregate double or treble the sum.

Mr. President, I have no desire to make any comparison of the duty on sugar with that proposed on other commodities, but a study of the bill will demonstrate that there are hundreds of other commodities in which a much smaller proportion of our population is interested, on which are imposed much higher duties than that we propose to levy on sugar. The prime purpose of increasing the duty on sugar is to expand the domestic-sugar industry and to divert hundreds of thousands of acres now devoted to grain crops, of which there is a surplus, to a crop of which we are now importing from Cuba approximately 50 per cent of our requirements.

I have attempted to demonstrate that the American consumer will feel the effect of an increase in only the slightest measure. Since this is true, the argument that the tariff will benefit only 1 per cent of our population carries little weight. If we fail to grant protection to 1 per cent of our farming population merely because it is only 1 per cent, we take the position that minorities must be penalized because they are minorities.

PROponents AND OPponents OF INCREASED DUTY

Mr. President, let us examine the records and ascertain who are advocating and who opposing an increased duty on sugar. Among those appearing before the House and Senate committees or who have filed briefs are the National Grange, American Farm Bureau Federation, Northwest Agricultural Foundation, Mountain States Beet Growers' Marketing Association, Northwestern Ohio and Southern Michigan Sugar Beet Growers' Association, Indiana Sugar Beet Growers' Association, Michigan State Farm Bureau, South Dakota Beet Growers, Utah State Farm Bureau, Commissioner of Agriculture of Wyoming, Progressive Pomona Grange, No. 4, of Colorado, Crowley County (Colo.) Farmers' Institute, Western Colorado Beet Growers' Association, Weld County (Colo.) Farmers' Institute, Sevier County (Utah) Farm Bureau, Racine-Kenosha (Wis.) Counties Beet Growers' Association, Michigan State Department of Agriculture, and the Idaho Beet Growers' Association.

In addition to these appearances before the committees the following important farm organizations have filed with Senators a statement advocating an increase in the sugar tariff: National

Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, National Dairy Union, American Livestock Association, National Wool Marketing Council, Vegetable Growers' Association of America, Kansas State Livestock Association, National Livestock Producers' Association. Hundreds of briefs and statements have also been filed with the Senate committee urging the proposed increase from chambers of commerce throughout the South and West. Among the appearances before the committee may also be cited the Domestic Sugar Producers' Association, the United States Beet Sugar Association, the American Sugar Cane League, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, and the Association of Sugar Producers of Porto Rico.

Among those opposing the proposed increase before the Senate committee were the United States Sugar Association, representing Americans with money invested in the Cuban sugar industry; the American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages; American Exporters and Importers' Association. The Hershey chocolate interests, who have sugar refineries in Cuba, opposed an increase of the duty on refined, and in lieu of an increased duty on raw recommended the granting of a bounty on sugar produced in continental United States.

Ah, Mr. President, how Mr. Hershey and his company do love the people! How sympathetic they are for the boy and the girl who eat chocolate bars! When I recently asked his representative if when sugar declined from 10 and 12 cents a pound to 4 and 5 cents a pound he increased the size of the bar, he said "No," but he did say that if the duty was increased 44 cents a hundred pounds the Hershey Chocolate Co. would have to make the chocolate bars smaller, and the poor child would not be able to obtain as much chocolate for its money. He never thought of the poor children when the price of sugar was declining; he then kept the bar at the same size, and the American child for 10 years has been paying, under his theory of what should be paid, a cost based on the higher price of sugar, although the price of sugar was low during practically that whole period of time.

Then we had the bottlers, the "pop" people, before the committee. "Pop" was 5 cents a bottle when sugar was 10 cents a pound, and it is 5 cents a bottle to-day. They spent \$25,000 through their lobby to show the iniquity, as they say, of the effort of those who are asking for an increase of 44 cents a hundred pounds in the duty on sugar. Good heavens, Mr. President, how many bottles of "pop" could be made from a hundred pounds of sugar? How many children would ever pay less for a drink of "pop" if the sugar tariff were lowered? If the tariff were reduced to 1 cent a pound, "pop" would still remain at 5 cents a bottle.

Aside from those appearing before the Senate committee, the National City Bank of New York and W. T. Rawleigh, of Freeport, Ill., actively opposed any increase.

O Mr. President, if I could only tell the whole story of the intrigues and the rotten deals connected with this matter it would surprise the Senate. I would refer to the fact that a decision was reached at one time to destroy the sugar industry in the United States. I know the story. Is it any wonder that in the hearings I had little patience with some of the statements which were made.

The above citations demonstrate that the sugar tariff is an agricultural tariff and that an increased duty is advocated by all important farm organizations as an essential part of any farm relief plan. This attitude is but natural, for the farmer is a partner in the beet-sugar business. Under the participating contract between the factories and the farmers they are paid for their beets according to the net price received for the extracted sugar, the division being generally on a 50-50 basis. In addition, the contract fixes a guaranteed minimum price per ton of beets. With no other farm crop does the farmer enjoy such privilege.

The farm organizations are also of the belief, and rightly so, that with adequate protection the domestic beet-sugar industry could be extensively expanded, and that hundreds of thousands of acres now devoted to grain crops could be devoted to sugar production with profit to sugar-beet farmers, and at the same time decrease the volume of surplus crops which now prove so troublesome.

Let us now consider briefly the motives actuating those opposing the proposed rates. I have referred to the National City Bank, so perhaps I had better refer first to their activities.

TARIFF PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL CITY BANK

The National City Bank of New York has been broadcasting statements to banks throughout the country not only opposing an increase in the duty on sugar but many of them indirectly inimical to the credit of domestic beet-sugar companies. I ask Senators to read the hearings. The National City Bank went so far as to intimate that the domestic beet-sugar companies

could not borrow any more money, and warned their stockholders that the industry would be failure. Having acquired large sugar holdings in Cuba that bank would like to see the domestic sugar industry destroyed so that larger profits from its foreign investments might accrue.

During the skyrocketing of prices in 1920 the National City Bank, believing that large profits were to be made in loaning money to Cuban sugar mills, poured some hundred million or so dollars into that industry.

The result of this inflation is well known to everyone. Due to the cupidity of the Cubans and Americans with money invested in the Cuban industry, sugar gradually seeped into this country from all over the world, and at the end of 1920 the price of Cuban raws had dropped from 23½ cents a pound to approximately 1¼ cents. It was then, Mr. President, that the National City Bank thought that the wise thing to do was to take the Cuban sugar, throw it upon the market, kill the local industry, and then reap a thousand per cent reward when the sugar industry of this country was destroyed. Thank God, they were not successful in that effort, but it was due to no fault of theirs.

Due to this sudden deflation it is alleged that the National City Bank was left with something like a hundred million dollars of securities which were practically worthless. In other words, the officials of that bank through lack of judgment had squandered millions of dollars gambling that the outrageous levels would be continued permanently. Nine years ago, I repeat, the National City lent its name and its resources to a program which was designed to continue abnormal sugar prices.

Mr. President, it is greatly to the advantage of the National City that we vote no adequate protection for sugar, and in the same degree it is detrimental to the producers of domestic sugar. I submit that the final choice lies between the injudicious investments of the National City Bank of Wall Street, and the conservative investments of American farmers in American agriculture. We must not be misled by the false arguments advanced by an institution which a few short years ago attempted to levy tribute on the American people by taking advantage of unduly high prices. We can not consider seriously the propaganda that such an institution has completely changed face and is now the saviour of the American people.

Notwithstanding the great deflation in Cuban sugar prices, the general impression prevailed in the sugar trade in 1920 that after the deflation period had passed and conditions became normal, large profits would have been earned on money invested in that industry. This idea was rightly predicated on the fact that sugar can be produced cheaper in Cuba than any other country. After the crash came in 1921 many Cuban mills were deeply in debt financially to the National City Bank. That institution promptly set about "squeezing" the Cubans and taking control of their properties. Look at the record, Senators. See how humane they were, and how much interest they had in building up this great industry. At the present time the officials of that bank are broadcasting propaganda against an increase in our sugar tariff because they allege it will be harmful to the "poor Cubans." I want to say now to the good people here that if we in this country lived as extravagantly as some of the Cuban people are living, there would be quite a change in the minds of the American people, and there would be a reformation. But the insincerity of the interest of the bank officials in the Cuban people is obvious when we remember that they had no hesitancy in putting the "thumbscrews" upon them when the opportunity was presented.

Having exacted its pound of flesh from the "poor Cubans," this bank took over the better-organized mills of its creditors and formed a holding company known as General Sugars (Inc.), under which it is now operating these mills.

I make no charges against the National City Bank; but, Mr. President, its stockholders and the public at large would, I believe, be very much interested in the details of the formation of General Sugars (Inc.). In my own mind I have not the slightest doubt that an investigation by a committee of the Senate of the activities of the National City Bank in gaining control of a considerable number of sugar mills in Cuba would bring to light information which the stockholders of that company and the public are entitled to have.

CAMPAIGN OF MISINFORMATION ILLUSTRATED BY "WISCONSIN SURVEY"

Some days ago the distinguished Senator from Georgia caused to be inserted in the Record the text of a pamphlet dealing with agricultural tariffs, prepared by three members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin—John R. Commons, Selig Perlman, and Benjamin H. Hibbard. These economists—eminent economists, I am sure—worked without the authority of the university, according to its president, Mr. Glenn Frank, although there have been several stupid attempts to convey the impres-

sion that the report was sponsored by the school. On the contrary, the teachers were "generously" financed by one W. T. Rawleigh, of Freeport, Ill., a manufacturer of spices and kitchen extracts, who maintains in Washington the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau, an agency which several times each week lectures by mimeograph on economic subjects to Members of Congress.

Of Mr. Rawleigh I know very little, except that he is rated by Dun & Co. as a multimillionaire. He has been at various times an alderman and mayor of Freeport and member of the Illinois General Assembly, as well as chairman of the La Follette-for-President Committee in 1924. His business interests have been largely in manufacturing, and when it is considered that he has purchased the services of three economists and has funds to indulge his whim for propaganda, there seems little doubt that he has prospered under the American system of protective tariffs. Now, in the afterglow, he proposes to issue a new emancipation proclamation—a proposal to "rid America of the protective-tariff system regardless of the fact that he has made no vigorous protest in all the years he was its beneficiary.

I remember Mr. Rawleigh in 1922. I remember Mr. Rawleigh in 1909; and what a change has taken place from 1909 and 1922! In 1909 he did not give out advertising like the pamphlet I have in my hand. His men went from house to house at a time when he was deeply interested in the tariff question.

Again, about these economists:

In the preface to the pamphlet prepared by the wise men of Wisconsin, Mr. Rawleigh remarks:

Every duty on imports is a tax out of the pockets of the consumers for the benefit of those protected.

Is it possible that Mr. Rawleigh developed this squeamishness only after he had become wealthy enough to hire a staff of economists who for a price were willing to prepare the report that he desired? I do not believe for a moment that the professors prostituted their convictions in drawing up the tract, nor have I any knowledge that Mr. Rawleigh instructed them as to the findings. Rather, I am persuaded that such a course was entirely unnecessary, since the professors themselves apparently believe in low tariffs and free trade more fervently than their employer. It is their privilege and the privilege of Mr. Rawleigh so to believe, and I have no objection. Yet I do object most vigorously to the issuance of so prejudiced a tract as a "scientific study," and to the attempt to foist it upon the American people as an "unbiased" and dispassionate analysis of agricultural tariffs.

Perhaps it is not entirely beside the point to inquire whether the professors have any standing as agricultural experts. Mr. Commons has written a great deal, his titles ranging from A Sociological Theory of Sovereignty to A Theory of Concerted Action and Reasonable Value; but I can not find that he qualifies as a farm expert or an expert on tariffs. Mr. Perlman's field of interest is still further restricted. His books are A History of Trade Unionism in the United States and A Theory of the Labor Movement. Mr. Hibbard apparently knows—or should know—something about farming, since he teaches agricultural economics at Wisconsin, and has written a textbook on the subject.

Mr. President, I can not pretend to tell how all the material for this survey was gathered, but I do have definite information concerning that part which deals with sugar. When the first reports of the survey became current, Mr. George McCormick, president of the Menominee River Sugar Co., Menominee, Mich., began a personal investigation. He visited the university and conferred with Mr. Hibbard and two of his young assistants. Of this conference, Mr. McCormick said:

I spent five consecutive hours with them going over their report. I pointed out the inaccuracies and the unjust conclusions which they had drawn, and elicited the information that they had gathered their data from published reports from a variety of sources, but had done no original research or investigation themselves. In other words, they had made a summary of data gathered by others and used it in an attempt to prove what was evidently a preconceived notion of their own concerning the tariff on sugar.

It was after this conference with Mr. McCormick, I believe, that these eminent economists found it necessary to correct some of their more idiotic errors. At any rate, the pamphlet now circulating is called a "revision." I am not sufficiently learned to know how seriously the professors erred in their calculations concerning other schedules, but if they missed the mark half so widely as they missed the mark in sugar, every line of the tract is verbal rubbish.

In passing, I should like to observe that the three professors were something more than impartial scholars in this affair. They not only prepared the survey but they also released material to the press. That is, Mr. Rawleigh's economists not only

were scholars but they were propagandists as well. Strange enough, the first drafts of the tract were hustled to the National City Bank, which redistributed the section dealing with sugar, and ever since has been engaged in a despicable attempt to prove that the domestic sugar industry is of no importance and worthy of no consideration. Just at the moment the National City is persuaded that Mr. Commons, Mr. Perlman, and Mr. Hibbard are the final authorities in any discussion of the sugar tariff. The adulation which it extends to these men is a bit amazing in view of the fact that the bank, so far as I know, never before has permitted its judgment, good or bad, to be influenced by theorists.

Even if the National City Bank has taken no part in the dissemination of the misinformation prepared at the University of Wisconsin, practical sugar men of the Nation would still entertain grave fears about accepting the advice of theorists. That fear extends back to 1919 when the beet-sugar distribution committee and Sugar Equalization Board, which held prices at a reasonable level during the war, were still in existence. All these men save one—Dr. F. W. Taussig, an economist of some consequence, and at one time head of the Tariff Commission—were practical sugar men. In their discussion of the situation which prevailed at the close of 1919 they recommended that the United States acquire control of the 1920 crop. On August 14, 1919, the majority members of the board transmitted to President Wilson a lengthy memorandum, in which they said:

Conditions are so abnormal and the prospect of securing a regular supply of sugar at a reasonable price * * * for the year 1920 is so uncertain that the Equalization Board concludes that its duty requires it to suggest to the President of the United States * * * that negotiations be entered into for the purpose of securing the sugar required * * *.

The beet-sugar committee on September 26 made a similar recommendation, basing its conclusion on the then existing conditions of the sugar market and strongly recommending a continuation of Government control.

Doctor Taussig did not agree in the opinions above quoted, and in a dissenting memorandum he remarked:

I believe that no negotiations should be entered into with the Cuban producers, and that the regulation and restriction of the sugar prices should cease with the close of the present arrangement * * *.

For some reason which may be clear to the Democratic mind, President Wilson declined to accept the advice of practical business men. He made no reply to their repeated requests for his judgment, and as a consequence the 1920 crop was handled in the manner which Doctor Taussig suggested. What happened then? Exactly those things which the men of the industry had feared. The domestic sugar supply was practically exhausted, and Cuba was thrust into control of the world sugar markets, and profited extravagantly.

If the advice of the practical men had been followed, there is no doubt that the price of sugar would have continued at a sane level, just as it had in the years previous. But the vestments of the practical men were not embroidered with Ph. D.'s, and their advice, of course, was worthless.

Now we are asked once more to accept the opinion of three economists and half a dozen of their assistants in a matter of which they have not the slightest practical knowledge. Practical sugar men—some of them the men who, in 1919, recommended that the work of the Government agencies be extended—have appeared before the Senate Finance Committee to tell of the absolute necessity of a higher rate on sugar. They have assured us that a higher rate is no threat to the consumer, that it is no threat to the welfare of Cuba.

If experience teaches us anything, it teaches that we ought to accept their advice.

Mr. President, at this time I shall conclude. I have other matters to present to the Senate, but I do not feel like proceeding longer to-day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the Senator from Utah what course he suggests should be taken now?

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that we go right on. It is only 10 minutes of 4 o'clock.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let us have a quorum, then.

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Borah	Copeland	Frazier
Ashurst	Bratton	Couzens	George
Baird	Brock	Dale	Gillett
Bingham	Brookhart	Deneen	Glass
Black	Broussard	Dill	Goff
Blaine	Capper	Fess	Gould
Blaise	Caraway	Fletcher	Greene

Grundy	Keyes	Patterson	Swanson
Hale	King	Phipps	Thomas, Idaho
Harris	La Follette	Plue	Townsend
Harrison	McCulloch	Pittman	Trammell
Hatfield	McKellar	Ransdell	Tydings
Hawes	McMaster	Robinson, Ind.	Vandenberg
Hayden	McNary	Schall	Wagner
Hobert	Metcalf	Sheppard	Walcott
Heflin	Moses	Shortridge	Walsh, Mass.
Howell	Norbeck	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Johnson	Norris	Smith	Waterman
Jones	Nye	Smoot	Watson
Kean	Oddie	Steiner	Wheeler
Kendrick	Overman	Sullivan	

Mr. SCHALL. My colleague [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is unavoidably absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in many respects I regard the sugar schedule as one of the most important to be disposed of in connection with the pending legislation. Sugar is a commodity which affects practically every household in the United States.

The activity of the tariff lobbies on sugar should not affect the consideration of this important schedule. No one will deny that there have been employed by both the high-duty lobby and the lower-duty lobby tactics which can not be defended. I condemn the methods which have been used to influence action upon the sugar tariff. I stand ready to support legislation to prevent the pernicious activities of lobbies and lobbyists, but I contend that it is the responsibility of the Senate to weigh the facts concerning sugar and to fix the duty based upon the facts without regard to the activities of interested parties on both sides of this controversy.

I am opposed to any increase in the duty on sugar as provided in existing law. I propose to demonstrate that the facts do not warrant any increased burden upon the consumer. At the same time I expect to demonstrate that the increase in duty proposed will not in the long run benefit the domestic producer of sugar within the United States.

Mr. President, no other agricultural commodity equals sugar in value of imports. The imports of cane sugar in 1928 amounted to \$161,257,843, while imports of all of the many commodities included in Schedule 7—the general agricultural schedule—amounted to but \$297,722,762. Federal and State governmental assistance brought about the establishment of the beet-sugar industry in the United States. Cane and beet sugar, almost alone among agricultural crops, have consistently been the beneficiaries of the tariff or bounty encouragement. It may at first, therefore, seem plausible to add a little more duty now, and, if the Finance Committee's proposal to increase the sugar tariff could aid substantially in raising the economic status of agriculture, or if actual public benefit could be expected to follow, the plea for more protection might perhaps be justified.

But, Mr. President, the sugar tariff problem is not so simple as that. The Senate well knows the story of the long battle down through the years over our tariff policy toward sugar. Congress has so long acquiesced in a protective policy for sugar that the principle of protection is now hardly an issue. The major question now is not whether the sugar growers shall continue to enjoy a tariff advantage over their foreign competitors, but how great this advantage shall be, and whether the paragraph now before us can be demonstrated to be of real advantage to the American farmers.

Other Senators during the course of the debate doubtless will review in detail the evidence—or the supposed evidence—offered during the tariff hearings by witnesses who appeared on their own behalf, or on behalf of the intricately interlocking group of domestic sugar growers' associations. If greater assistance is not granted, these witnesses protested, the production of sugar will tend to disappear from the continental United States.

There are, however, Mr. President, certain other facts which were not emphasized at the committee hearings, but which must be taken into consideration if the Senate wishes to adopt a rational sugar policy, a policy which will be of real pecuniary value to the sugar-beet and sugar-cane farmer.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUGAR TARIFF PROBLEM

Few commodities are consumed more widely in the United States than sugar. The duty on sugar affects virtually every purse in the United States, bearing most heavily, proportionately, upon the poor and upon the moderately well to do. The consumer is interested in the prices of confectionery, beverages, and other commodities, manufactured in large part of sugar. In turn the manufacturers of these products have a large economic stake in the question now before us, just as have the refiners of sugar.

In contrast with the sugar growers, the majority of the farmers are concerned in this controversy primarily as con-

sumers of sugar. Even among the sugar growers there are wide differences in economic position, between many middle western growers who can produce only at very high costs, and certain western beet-sugar producers and southern cane planters who doubtless could continue to grow sugar even if the tariff were removed entirely.

The sugar growers of the continental United States have even in the best of the last 10 years hardly succeeded in producing more than a fifth of the country's annual sugar consumption. Sugar produced in the continental States must compete, without tariff protection, against the tropically grown sugar of Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. When all of the sugar grown within the tariff barrier is combined, the total still constitutes only half of our annual consumption. There is no indication at the present time that any expedient to which we can resort—except at a clearly exorbitant cost—can greatly increase this proportion, or increase the production of the continental United States beyond the 20 per cent ratio at which it has stood for many years. Under our reciprocity treaty of 1903, granting the neighboring Republic of Cuba a 20 per cent reduction in the tariff rates imposed against all other countries, the other 50 per cent of the sugar consumed by the United States is grown in Cuba. To disregard our traditional responsibilities toward our neighbor Republic must inevitably jeopardize the existence of friendly political and trade relations with all of the other nations of Latin America. Our sugar tariff policy largely determines the internal economic welfare of Cuba, of Porto Rico, of Hawaii, and to a lesser degree, of the Philippine Islands. Our sugar tariff policy must also be considered in the light of the needs of our own Federal Treasury, which for many years has derived a fourth of all customs receipts from the duty on sugar.

I have suggested only a few of the important questions which ought to enter into our deliberations over the duty on sugar. It is not my purpose to discuss them at length at the present time.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. May I ask the Senator how an increase of duty to 2.20 or 2.40 could disturb our relations with Latin-American countries when every one of them has a higher duty than 2.40 against the Cuban sugar?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my contention that to disrupt the economic welfare of Cuba would inevitably create a feeling throughout the other Latin-American countries against the United States regardless of what may be their policy toward imports of Cuban sugar. The Senator must remember that our relations with Cuba have been of a very close nature. I believe that such actions on the part of this Government as would seriously disrupt the economic welfare of Cuba tend to create animosity among the Latin-American countries toward the United States, because they would contend that we had not treated Cuba fairly in this respect. Whether those countries would be justified in that contention or not is another matter. But if the Senator has been perusing some of the editorials which have been appearing in the press concerning the controversy over sugar, I think he would come to the same conclusion.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Does the Senator think it would be possible for any citizen of the Republic of Brazil, for instance, which has a 17-cent per pound duty against Cuban sugar, to take offense at our raising our duty from 1.76 cents to 2.40 cents? Then I will ask another question and the Senator may answer both. If we are disturbing the economic conditions of Cuba by raising the duty as proposed here, does the Senator consider that of more importance than to disrupt the domestic industry by not raising it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will answer the Senator's questions in the order in which they were propounded. First, I do not contend that our action in increasing the duty on sugar against Cuba would necessarily create hard feeling in the Latin-American countries because of any rate which we might fix. But, as I stated before in response to a similar question, my contention is that, in view of the relationship which has existed between the United States and Cuba, our action, no matter where we might fix the rate, if it produced an economic destruction in Cuba, would be resented in other Latin-American countries. Also, I do not contend that the reaction of Cuba and Latin America is a major factor in this problem.

In answer to the Senator's second question, of course, I am not taking the position that the action which we may take here concerning Cuba is of primary importance. I merely mentioned it in the course of an introduction to my remarks upon sugar as one of the elements which I think should be given consideration.

Mr. BROUSSARD. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that since 1904 and up to 1927 the advantages of trade in favor of Cuba, by reason of the treaty which we have with her, have favored Cuba to the extent of over \$2,000,000,000 to a population of 3,500,000, and the raising of the duty will not disturb those conditions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Nevertheless, the Senator well knows that the raising of the duty may have a serious effect upon a very important industry in Cuba. The contention which I make is that if our action has that result, then, naturally, in view of our long and intimate relationship with the Republic of Cuba, our action will be felt to have been unjustified. Whether that position is sound or not is beside the point. I am simply mentioning it as one of the results which may follow if this action is taken.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin a further question?

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BROUSSARD. After listening to the Senator thus far in his speech, I assume that his first contention is that the consumer will be made to pay the increased tariff rate; but in the next breath, states the Senator, that Cuba will have to pay it. Can they both pay it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, Mr. President; that is not my contention. If the Senator from Louisiana will follow my remarks, he will find that that is not the position which I take. My position is that if we take this action, and the sugar produced as a result of such action does not find the market in the United States which it has heretofore found, and if, as a result of that, there is a depression in that important industry in Cuba, the effect will be as I have already outlined.

Mr. BROUSSARD. If the American consumer pays the increase, how can it hurt the Cubans?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it may have an effect upon consumption in the United States. No one can say definitely what the effect of it will be in that regard. I intend to discuss later in my remarks the point raised by the Senator as to who will pay the increase in duty.

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WATERMAN. Mr. President, if the 20 per cent differential in favor of Cuba remains, and the duty as against Cuba is increased in the general tariff, it will give Cuba a greater advantage than she now has, will it not, because the differential will be 20 per cent of a larger amount? If that be so, and we are compelled, as I have heard it stated on the floor here several times that we shall be compelled, to purchase one-half of our consumption of sugar from abroad somewhere, with Cuba having that differential, she will always supply that deficiency on the part of our own production, will she not, because of the differential of 20 per cent? How then will Cuba be injured in any way whatsoever by our increase of the tariff, provided always that the differential of 20 per cent shall be maintained in her favor as against the world?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, there are two elements, as I see, which may enter into it: First, there may be a reduction in consumption in the United States; second, the expansion of the sugar production in our island dependencies may capture more of our market, thus supplying more of the sugar which we are now purchasing from countries that are outside of the tariff barrier.

Mr. WATERMAN. But the Senator will admit, will he not, that Porto Rico and Hawaii are practically at the peak of production. The Philippines probably are not; but the Philippines are not going to produce in my time—perhaps they will in the Senator's time—sufficient sugar to drive Cuba out of the American market. We are fixing a tariff now not forever, but to meet present conditions and for the few years ahead which we can see; that is all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with the Senator in the statement that Porto Rico has practically reached the peak of her production. I am not certain but that increased irrigation and improvement of stock may not further expand the Hawaiian production. There seems to be some controversy among the experts upon that point. There also is disagreement as to how rapidly the Philippines may increase their production.

Mr. President, the sugar schedule constitutes an especially forceful illustration of the woeful inadequacy of the present methods of tariff making. To guide us in dealing with the

highly complex problem before us we have a report of the Tariff Commission prepared years ago on the basis of the crops for 1922-23 and earlier years, a very inadequate Summary of Information submitted by the present Tariff Commission, and some hundreds of pages of so-called evidence consisting of the assertions of the witnesses who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee. There is not available a comprehensive, official statement of the facts which ought to be taken into account. We do not know how many farmers can continue to grow sugar beets if the tariff is not increased, and how many might grow sugar beets if the tariff were increased. So, we must fall back upon the best generalizations which we can derive from our experience with the sugar industry in previous years.

In 1921 Congress increased the duty on sugar from the 1-cent rate adopted in 1913 to 1.6 cents, and in 1922 the Fordney-McCumber Act made a further increase to 1.76 cents. For our purposes it is necessary only to consider the duty on sugar of approximately 96° purity, for all but a small percentage of our imports approximate this standard. Also, we need consider only the duty on sugar imported under the preferential rate accorded to Cuba, for in ordinary years the amount shipped in at the so-called full rate of duty is trifling in importance.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House, in its report on the Hawley bill, stated that the changes asked for "by the trade varied from a reduction of approximately one-half of 1 cent per pound to an increase of 1½ cents per pound on 96° raw sugar from Cuba." The rate agreed upon of 2.4 cents a pound on Cuban sugar, the committee said, "was the figure most generally suggested by the witnesses." In summarizing such examination of these "suggestions" as the committee may have made, its report merely says:

Consideration was given * * * to the fact that the duty-paid price of 96° raw sugar in New York has for several months been at or below \$3.76 per 100 pounds and that the domestic industry could not survive at that low price of raw sugar. Labor rates in Cuba and in the Philippines, compared with wage rates in the United States, and the prices paid for cane and beets were considered in fixing the new rates of duty.

The specific figures upon which the committee asserted that its conclusions had been based were not cited.

The Senate Finance Committee held further hearings on the sugar schedule during the hot days of last July. The increase of six-tenths of a cent a pound on sugar proposed by the House had met with widespread denunciation and unpopularity. The Finance Committee therefore felt moved to make a gesture toward the consumer by reducing the proposed rate to 2.2 cents a pound on 96° Cuban sugar, still an increase of forty-four one-hundredths of a cent, or, roughly, half a cent a pound over the rate in the existing law. In recommending a substantial increase in duty over the existing law the committee also made a gesture toward the farmer. Then, as a final gesture of profundity, the committee inserted in its report exactly three lines in explanation of the rate which it had adopted. These three lines said:

The rates on all items in this schedule have received careful consideration and the changes made have been made with the interests of the consumers, producers, importers, and manufacturers in mind. (P. 21.)

How these interests were measured, the report cannily failed to say. And nowhere did the committee indicate the results which it expected would follow from this increase in duty, or the sugar policy which the Federal Government should adopt.

It is difficult to take the committee's amendment seriously in view of its failure to justify the recommendation. Did the committee think that an increase would safeguard the present production, or that it would bring about an increase in production? Did it consider the possibility of a shrinking sugar labor supply? Why did it reject the House increase? And why did it feel that its own compromise increase was economically better justified? Nowhere is there an indication that the committee heeded one of the first principles of tariff making, that always the cost of the end sought should first be measured so that the country will not be paying for something which it does not get, or be paying exorbitantly for a fraction of that which was promised to it.

Mr. President, the sugar tariff problem can not be solved by idle gestures or by sleight-of-hand tricks. Sham farm relief measures are far more dangerous than no farm relief at all.

After many years of governmental encouragement the sugar industry of the continental United States is still unable to produce more than 20 per cent of the country's annual sugar consumption. Even if the production of the tropical island dependencies is included, the proportion of production to consumption hardly rises above 50 per cent. The relative importance of the

various sources of supply for the period 1922-1928, and for the year 1928 alone, is shown in the two following tables, which I ask without reading to have inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

*Relative importance in the United States sugar consumption of various sources of supply
(Average, 1922-1928)*

Source of supply	Average 1922-1928	
	Amount long tons refined basis ¹	Per cent of total
Continental United States:		
Cane.....	130,168	2.40
Beet.....	872,841	16.08
Total.....	1,003,009	18.48
Noncontiguous territories:		
Hawaii.....	589,302	10.86
Porto Rico.....	5,149	7.63
Philippines.....	414,332	6.32
Virgin Islands.....	343,144	.10
Total.....	1,351,927	24.91
Foreign countries:		
Cuba (tariff concession).....	3,027,632	55.78
Other (full duty).....	45,382	.83
Total.....	3,073,014	56.61
Total supply for consumption.....	5,427,950	100.00

¹ 107 pounds of 96° centrifugal is equal to approximately 100 pounds of refined sugar.

Consumption of sugar in the United States in 1928

	Short tons	Per cent
Continental United States (cane and beet) ¹	1,292,543	20.82
Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Virgin Islands (duty free).....	1,428,645	23.01
Philippine Islands (duty free).....	533,200	8.59
Cuba (preferential).....	2,920,410	47.05
Full duty.....	32,955	.53
Total.....	6,207,753	100.00

¹ Figures include a small amount of sugar from duty-free molasses and domestic maple sugar.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the annual production has remained remarkably constant throughout the last decade, and increased production has been brought about only in the islands which to a great degree enjoy advantages of climate, soil, and labor supply similar to those of Cuba. Favorable crop conditions, and recovery of the Louisiana plantations from the diseases which in 1927 had reduced the continental cane crop to 47,000 tons, now make it appear probable that this year's total continental production will again approach the total for 1922. The December 11, 1929, estimates of the Department of Agriculture forecasted a total continental crop of 1,249,000 tons of sugar, of which 1,041,000 tons are expected to be beet sugar, while the sugar crop from cane is expected to total 208,000 tons. Yet, even this increase will hardly disturb the ordinary ratio of 5 to 1 between the total consumption of the United States and the production within the 48 States of this continent. Production figures for the United States and its insular dependencies are given, in short tons, in the following table which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

[Short tons]

Year	Beet	Louisiana cane	Total United States	Total for islands	Total United States and islands
1918-19.....	755,879	280,898	1,036,777	1,236,646	2,273,423
1919-20.....	731,312	220,999	952,311	1,303,712	2,256,024
1920-21.....	1,085,749	109,116	1,254,865	1,347,259	2,602,124
1921-22.....	1,020,533	324,429	1,344,962	1,352,731	2,697,693
1922-23.....	689,848	295,095	984,943	1,325,056	2,310,000
1923-24.....	881,683	162,024	1,043,707	1,569,028	2,612,735
1924-25.....	1,091,087	88,482	1,179,569	2,095,327	3,274,896
1925-26.....	900,972	139,381	1,040,353	1,891,119	2,931,472
1926-27.....	987,396	47,165	1,034,561	2,103,804	3,138,365
1927-28.....	1,081,070	70,792	1,151,862	2,287,177	3,439,039

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, rash statements that the continental United States can produce all of the sugar which they consume were again repeated by visionaries who appeared at the hearings on the sugar schedule. To support their contentions they produced no facts or figures, only a glowing optimism. The illusory hope that the United States can become self-sufficient with regard to the production of sugar has persisted tenaciously since the 1890's, but has never come within sight of its goal. The hopelessness of any attempt to increase substantially the production of sugar within the continental United States by increasing the tariff on sugar was admitted before the Ways and Means Committee by W. D. Lippitt, general manager of the Great Western Sugar Co., and spokesman for the United States Beet Sugar Association:

I think that the increase in continental beet production would be relatively slow. I differ materially with many of the witnesses who have testified to-day on that point. I doubt that any reasonable tariff would permit us to expand the industry in any reasonable period of time to supply our own requirements. I think, even under such an increase as has been suggested (to 2.4 cents against Cuba), that our increase in production, our expansion in continental United States, would barely keep pace with the increase in consumption (p. 3331).

Mr. President, I submit that here is an answer to this proposition which is continually put forward whenever we have the tariff on sugar under discussion; and it comes from one of the representatives of the beet interests in the United States.

The virtual impossibility of expanding our continental production of sugar has nothing to do with the amount of land available for sugar production, so far as soil fertility and climate are concerned. Were these the only factors to be taken into account the dream of self-sufficiency might come true, but there are two virtually insurmountable obstacles. Mr. Lippitt spoke of one when he pleaded for a restriction against free imports from the Philippine Islands, saying "unless the Philippine question is handled along with this and made a part of it, I doubt if we can increase at all." Philippine competition is, however, not alone a menace to the expansion of the continental industry, and economically can not be considered apart from the competition of the sugar produced in all of our other insular dependencies.

More important, Mr. President, in my judgment, is the second obstacle—that of labor costs. The cultivation of sugar beets, as we all know, involves a tremendous amount of back breaking, dirty, menial hand labor. Unremitting efforts to invent machinery which would displace some of this hand labor have been successful to only a small degree. The great bulk of the labor in the fields is now done by hand, and, so far as any information in our possession justifies us in prophesying, will continue to be done by hand.

The nature of the work to be done, and the low wages which the industry has felt able to pay, have made it necessary to depend upon cheap immigrant labor. When, last spring, Michigan beet growers appealed to the governor of the State for convict labor to meet an emergency labor shortage, A. B. Cook, a leading beet grower, said frankly:

Cultivating and harvesting beets is not a real American farmer's job. * * * It is a toilsome and a dirty job.

For many years immigrant labor from Europe was plentiful. It has been cut off by our restrictive immigration policy, a policy not likely to be altered. Sugar growers, not only in the Southwest but in the Middle West as well, have been forced to turn to Mexican labor pushing up from the south. Even this supply will probably not be available indefinitely. Restrictions upon the entry of Mexican labor into the United States have been urged strongly for many years. Spanish-Americans now resident on this side of the border are slowly improving their own living standards, so that they will be less and less ready to work in the beet fields for the mere pittance which the economic situation of the industry permits. Instead of expanding, to permit an increase in beet production, the industry's labor supply will in all probability shrink more and more.

In the meantime the sugar industry has been guilty of labor conditions so debased that the industry might well be ashamed to come before us asking for an increase in the duty levied for its benefit. Long hours, child labor, field labor on the part of every member of the family, and unsuitable housing have been all too characteristic of the conditions inflicted upon the beet workers. These charges are fully substantiated by official reports and by the investigations of private students. The evidence was presented fully and ably by Representative FEAR, of Wisconsin, during the debate in the House, and he demonstrated conclusively that an increased tariff can not remove the economic disadvantages which have led to the miserable labor con-

ditions of the beet fields, in which much of the work is done by "Mexican peons, immature children, and women."

For these reasons it would appear that no one but an irresponsible visionary can seriously hope that the sugar-growing industry in the continental United States will, within any period of time which we can now take into account, expand sufficiently to give us more than the 20 per cent of our consumption which it has produced during the last decade. If that is the case, all that any sane protective policy can seek to accomplish is the safeguarding of those farmers who are now in the business of sugar growing.

WIDE DIFFERENCES IN PRODUCTION COSTS

Even if this is the policy upon which we propose to act, we can not overlook the certainty that any rate which we can conscientiously adopt will be insufficient to guarantee an adequate profit to many of the present beet-sugar growers without at the same time giving inordinate profits to other beet growers, and probably to many of the sugarcane planters. A brief review of the differences within this country in the cost of producing sugar beets will illustrate my point.

The most thorough study of sugar-beet costs available to us is that prepared by the Tariff Commission for the years 1921, 1922, and 1923. This report was completed about 1927, at a time when the commission was dominated by members who took a friendly attitude toward the domestic industry. The commission averaged production costs for individual States, thus disguising the still wider cost variations within the individual States. The study disclosed that the differences in production costs, excluding capital charges between specific States, ranged all the way from \$5.60 to \$7.72 per ton in 1921, from \$4.42 to \$8.05 per ton in 1922, and from \$5.41 to \$7.49 per ton in 1923.

Even these figures do not adequately show the actual differences in cost of production arising out of disparities in climate, in soil fertility, or in efficiency. On the basis of calculations made only for the year 1922, the commission found that the costs at which beets had been produced actually varied, again excluding capital charges, from less than \$3.50 a ton to more than \$25 a ton in the United States. Of course, the amount of beets produced at either extreme were small; but the costs at which substantial tonnages were produced ranged all the way from \$4 a ton to \$8 a ton or more.

A more recent measure of the differences in production costs is given by data for the crop year 1927-28, in which the sugar-beet regions of Colorado, Nebraska, Utah, Idaho, and Montana gave a yield of 12.48 tons per acre, compared with 8 tons average in other sugar-beet regions. An acre of beets in the five most efficient Mountain States yielded, on the average, 3,430 pounds of sugar. The beet farms of Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, California, Nevada, Wyoming, and other States, yielded only 2,342 pounds of sugar per acre, on the average. The States containing the more efficient beet regions produced two-thirds of the sugar with 50 per cent greater efficiency than the yield of the other one-third.

It should not be necessary to point out here that no rational protective policy can propose to penalize the vast body of American consumers in the hope of assuring the prosperity of every producer, no matter how inefficient he may be. We could not do so if we tried. Should we adopt a rate high enough to cover the apparent disparity between the most inefficient producer and his competitors at home and abroad, the efficient domestic producer would be enabled, because of the excessiveness of the protection given him, to cut his price enough to freeze out the inefficient producer completely. In justice to the consumer, however, we can not afford even to embark upon so farcical a proceeding.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Even if the rate were raised, that situation would still obtain, would it not, because other areas not so well fitted for the production of beets would probably be put into production?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has put his finger upon a very serious aspect of this entire problem. It simply creates a vicious circle. If we increase the duty on sugar in this bill, in another five years there will be even higher-cost producers engaging in the production of sugar beets than there are to-day; and they, in turn, will be in a position to come before Congress and ask for further protection because they are not making a profit. It is the "old Army game" applied to the tariff. We not only have it concerning agricultural products, but we have it, of course, concerning industrial products. It has become quite the practice to have appeals for increased tariffs upon

industrial commodities put forward by those inefficient high-cost producers who may perhaps only produce a small quantity, but who, in their appearance before the committees of Congress, can make a case for increased protection.

INCREASE PROBABLY UNJUSTIFIED ON PRODUCTION-COST BASIS

I have already called attention to the incomplete nature of the case for an increase in the duty on sugar. Save for scattering figures submitted by individual witnesses on their own authority alone, the hearings on the sugar schedule contain little evidence supporting the demand for an increase other than simple assertions that the present rate is not high enough.

Two scientific analyses of the sugar problem have been made. One, by Dr. Philip G. Wright, published by the Institute of Economics in 1924, led by Mr. Wright—a distinguished economist and a student of the sugar situation for many years—to the conclusion that a duty of from 1.25 to 1.5 cents a pound, materially less than the rate in existing law, was sufficient. The much more exhaustive study of the Tariff Commission in 1924 showed that a duty of 1.23 cents would then adequately cover the differences between Cuban and American costs of production. Not only did these studies lead to the conclusion that the existing rate of 1.76 cents a pound was sufficient, but Mr. Wright estimated that 66 per cent of the domestic beet sugar, 42 per cent of the Louisiana cane sugar, 40 per cent of the Hawaiian cane sugar, and 30 per cent of the Porto Rican cane-sugar industries would have been able to survive in the year 1921-22 if the sugar tariff had been removed entirely.

The Tariff Commission's judgment was much the same. The commission said:

To a considerable degree American sugar production is independent of the tariff. Under a much lower tariff, and apparently even under free trade, a substantial percentage of the industry in all domestic regions would continue. Obviously the tariff is employed to raise domestic sugar prices so that the relatively high-cost producers may continue production, despite the competition of lower-cost producers both at home and abroad. The consequence, accordingly, is that low-cost producers received added profits from the increased price due to the tariff. (Report on Sugar, p. 95.)

Nevertheless, pleas for an increase in the duty are now before us in the form of the amendment recommended by the Finance Committee. Why we are confronted with this particular rate of 2.2 cents the Finance Committee's report does not tell us. The rate of 2.4 cents, we know, was that for which most of the domestic growers asked. Some of the growers in the Middle Western States said that even this would not be sufficient and asked for a 3-cent rate against Cuba. They lost out, however, in the logrolling contest which evidently took place among the various spokesmen for the domestic industry. How these gentlemen arrived at the 2.4-cent rate—unless by a process of logrolling—they have not chosen to tell us.

It seems apparent that the future existence of the domestic industry is dependent much less upon the tariff than upon transportation costs. The domestic industry now lives chiefly by virtue of its proximity to important consuming markets. This proximity will remain no matter what happens to the tariff, and it will become increasingly valuable as the Middle Western and Western States grow in industrialization.

Another very important factor which should guide our course of action is the dependency of the domestic sugar price upon the world sugar price. Expansion of world production has been primarily responsible for the depressed sugar prices of the last 12 months. As long as half of our sugar comes from Cuba, the Cuban price plus our tariff will practically determine prices within the United States. The Cuban price reflects the price which Cuban exporters could get in alternative European markets. Negotiations toward some agreement restricting production among all non-American producers are again in progress. Cuba herself has adopted a new export control agreement intended to raise the price received by the Cuban growers. Should this endeavor succeed the price at which Cuban sugar is landed in New York will again rise above its present level of 2 cents, and the sugar industry within this country will have gained all that it is now asking from us.

COST OF SUGAR DUTY TO THE CONSUMER

Inasmuch as about 107 pounds of raw cane sugar are required to manufacture 100 pounds of refined sugar, the existing 1.76 duty on Cuban sugar amounts to a duty of 1.88 cents per pound on the refined sugar actually consumed. Taking into account the occasional imports of sugar at the full duty rate, actual differences between domestic and export prices and the pyramiding of the duty on the part of the wholesalers and retailers through whose hands the sugar must pass before it reaches the ultimate consumer, the full burden of the present tariff on sugar reaches approximately 2.3 cents a pound. This is the additional

amount which the American consumer must pay as the price of assuring himself that one-fifth of the sugar which he consumes will be produced at home.

That the consumer does pay this amount is shown clearly enough by the history of sugar prices since 1922.

If it were not expected that the price would be increased by at least the amount of the additional duty now proposed, there would have been no point in demanding an increase in the tariff. The committee's amendment would then have been a senseless gesture. If it should be argued that part of the increase will be absorbed by the Cuban grower and not passed on to the American consumer, it is again obvious that this, too, could not be considered an efficient method of helping the American farmer. Even if the result were a crippling of some Cuban sugar plantations, so that they would be forced out of the market, the result would be slow and highly uncertain. The committee's policy would be nothing more than a speculation, the outcome of which no one could predict. No, Mr. President; I am too strongly convinced of the intelligence of the members of the Finance Committee to believe that those who supported this amendment did not do so in the full anticipation that the result would be an increase in the price of sugar within this country.

There is, undoubtedly, some question whether the duty on every pound of sugar is absorbed by the ultimate consumer or whether in some cases it is absorbed by manufacturers of products in which sugar is used. The Tariff Commission's Summary of Information says upon that point:

About two-thirds of the domestic consumption is used directly in the household, the remainder in various forms of manufacturing, e. g., bakers' products, confectionery, condensed milk, soft drinks, canned fruits, and tobacco.

We can only guess whether or not this proportion is correct. Unfortunately the only available figures based upon an actual tabulation were made for the year 1917, when the sugar equalization board estimated that from 25 to 40 per cent of the sugar consumption entered into manufactured goods. It may be that the proportion consumed in the household is now greater, for, as we have often been told, the American standard of living appears to be rising constantly. But, Mr. President, one can hardly believe that most of the manufacturers concerned do not find some method of passing on their increased expenditures for sugar, either by increasing the price of their commodities or by reducing the quality. Even though some manufacturer may absorb the increased cost, there are many more who pass on to the consumer far more than the increased cost justifies. There are also other means by which the manufacturer may pass on the cost to the consumer, either by reducing the quantity or by reducing quality. However, it seems perfectly clear that the tariff is ultimately paid out of the pockets of the public somewhere along the line.

The total already paid by the public under the existing rate of duty is enormous. The average annual sugar consumption in the United States during the period 1922-1928 was 12,158,608,000 pounds. Assuming that the duty somewhat enhanced was passed on to the consumer, the Nation's sugar bill was enlarged \$280,000,000 annually during this period. Based upon the consumption of 12,518,488,000 pounds in 1928, the additional sugar bill due to the tariff in that year amounted to \$289,000,000.

Not content with the amount now involved in our sugar subsidy policy, the committee's amendment proposes to increase the amount of duty per pound of raw 96° sugar by, roughly, half a cent a pound. The increased expenditure which the consumers of the country would be forced to make under this amendment, assuming that the consumption of sugar does not decrease, would amount to no less than \$66,000,000 a year, making the total annual burden of the sugar duty upon consumers in the United States more than \$354,000,000 annually.

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS FROM THE SUGAR TARIFF

This heavy burden might be viewed with greater equanimity if it were really paid to producers of sugar beets and cane within this country. Instead, a study of the records for the years 1922 to 1928 shows that of the \$280,000,000 annually contributed by sugar consumers, 48 per cent was paid into the National Treasury as customs receipts. Of the approximately 5,250,000,000 pounds of sugar produced on an average annually during those years behind our tariff barrier, the greater part, more than 3,000,000,000 pounds, was produced in Hawaii, in Porto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, and in the Philippines. These island producers benefited from our tariff policy fully as much as the producers upon our own continent. Assuming again that the tariff was fully effective, the advantage to the insular producers amounted to \$57,000,000 annually, or 20 per cent of the amount contributed by the consumers. More than

15 per cent more was lost through pyramiding of the price on the part of the middlemen who distributed the sugar from the refineries to the consumers.

Sugar growers within the United States during the same period produced an average of 2,247,000,000 pounds of sugar annually. Assuming once more that they were really benefited by the tariff to its full extent, the advantage which the continental sugar producers received amounted to \$42,500,000, or hardly more than 15 per cent of the prodigious sum paid out by consumers of sugar.

These figures are shown in the following table:

Distribution of the cost of the sugar tariff average, 1922-1928	
Cost to all consumers.....	\$280, 255, 914
12,158,608,000 pounds, at 2.305 cents per pound, the differential between the f. a. s. price for export and the wholesale price at New York City, 2.056 cents per pound, plus 12.13 per cent pyramiding, 0.249 cent per pound, making a total of 2.305 cents per pound.	
Government, revenue collected ¹ 48.24 per cent.....	135, 193, 551
Benefits, United States growers and refiners, 15.13 per cent.....	42, 407, 221
2,246,740,160 pounds, refined, at 1.8875 cents per pound; full amount of the Cuban rate reduced to a refined basis.	
Benefits, island growers and refiners, 20.40 per cent.....	57, 159, 474
3,028,316,480 pounds, refined, at 1.8875 cents per pound.	
Hawaii, 1,320,036,480 pounds.....	\$24, 915, 689
Virgin Islands.....	217, 700
Porto Rico, 928,103,680 pounds.....	17, 517, 957
Philippine Islands, 768,642,560 pounds.....	14, 508, 128
Pyramiding of price, 16.23 per cent.....	45, 495, 668
Total.....	280, 255, 914

The 2.4-cent rate proposed by the Ways and Means Committee would have increased the burden levied upon the consumer by \$95,000,000. The greater moderation exercised by the Finance Committee reduced this increase to \$66,000,000.

I think it would be interesting to calculate what would happen to those \$66,000,000 of additional burden which it is proposed to place upon the consumer if we enact this amendment into law. The Treasury will again take half, unless our own production increases tremendously, of which there is not the slightest possibility. A fourth will go into the pockets of insular producers and refiners. Some more will be lost on the way to the consumer through profits taken by wholesalers and retailers and through other expenses. The domestic industry will continue to get 15 per cent, or \$10,000,000, at a cost of \$66,000,000 to the sugar consumers in the United States.

The probable distribution of the benefits from the proposed increase in the duty and the changes in the situation under existing law are shown in the following table:

	Probable cost	Probable benefits	Per cent	Increase in benefits
Cost to all consumers.....	\$354, 523, 588			
(12,518,488,277 pounds, at 2.832 cents per pound (2.056 cents plus the increase of 0.47 cent per pound plus pyramiding of 0.306 cent per pound, or a total of 2.832).)				
U. S. Government, probable revenue.....		\$146, 583, 078	41.35	\$28, 996, 798
(Estimated on basis of 1928 imports, full duty rate of 2.75 cents per pound, and Cuban rate of 2.2 cents per pound of 96° centrifugal sugar.)				
Benefit, United States refiners and growers.....		54, 003, 020	15.23	10, 701, 958
(2,294,096,000 pounds refined, at 2.354 cents per pound—full amount of the Cuban rate reduced to a refined basis.)				
Benefits, island refiners and growers.....		94, 153, 359	26.55	18, 658, 683
(3,969,717,898 pounds refined, at 2.354 cents per pound.)				
Hawaii, 1,644,543,451 pounds.....	38, 712, 553			7, 671, 795
Virgin Islands, 20,528,216 pounds.....	483, 234			95, 764
Porto Rico, 1,242,117,245 pounds.....	29, 230, 440			5, 794, 477
Philippine Islands, 1,092,528,986 pounds.....	25, 718, 132			5, 096, 647
Pyramiding of the price.....		59, 784, 131	18.86	7, 614, 994
Total.....		354, 523, 588		65, 972, 433

I submit that this is a complete demonstration that the duty on sugar is an inefficient manner in which to help the growers of the sugar-producing crops in the United States, when we find,

¹ Average customs receipts from cane sugar only, 1923-1927.

as the result of experience, that the producers of sugar in continental United States get only 15 per cent of the total amount paid by American consumers as a result of the tariff on sugar. It is a demonstration that the sugar tariff is not an efficient tariff. It does not accomplish its objective.

Mr. President, not only has it failed to stimulate sugar production in the areas which it was intended to protect, but the greatest part of the advantage arising from the tariff has been diverted from its supposed beneficiaries. There is no reason why we should at this time seek to impose new revenue duties. If the surplus in the Treasury is mounting so constantly that it must be curtailed by income-tax reduction legislation, why should we turn another \$29,000,000 into the Treasury through new customs receipts as the result of a tax upon the pocket of American consumers?

THE INSULAR DEPENDENCIES AND THE TARIFF

Nor are there valid reasons why we should undertake to extend additional tariff protection to the sugar growers in our island dependencies. Economically they are already far better off, because of natural advantages, than the growers within the United States. The arguments presented by the representatives of the insular producers at the tariff hearings were even less economically defensible than those of the continental growers. Naturally they would not object to an increase in their profits, which for all of the larger companies are already substantial enough. This motive, together with a recognition on their part of the advantages to be gained from amicable rather than from hostile relations with the continental growers, makes it easy to understand the logrolling which must have gone on to enable both continental and insular growers to join in a request for a 2.4-cent duty against Cuba.

Payment to the insular growers of the largest share of the benefit from the sugar tariff is inevitable under any tariff scheme which we can adopt. Restrictions against imports from Porto Rico and from Hawaii would be of highly doubtful constitutionality. If we are willing to face the situation realistically at all, it must be clear to us that no restrictions will be imposed against either Porto Rico and Hawaii or against the Philippine Islands. Some expansion still appears to be possible in Porto Rico and in Hawaii through improved varieties of sugarcane and through additional irrigation. Given an adequate labor supply and sufficient capital, there is no reason to suppose that the rapid expansion which has marked Philippine sugar production in recent years will be halted unless the Philippine government itself should intervene for political reasons. It is unlikely that Philippine competition will cease to be a serious factor in the sugar markets of this country until the Government of the United States some day sees fit to give to the Philippine Islands their independence.

In view of all this, all the arguments for an increased duty as a means of national defense break down. Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines are all much farther from the United States geographically and strategically than the island of Cuba. The ties between the United States and Cuba are so close that it is inconceivable that Cuba would ever be allied against the United States in time of war.

In the main these contentions were admitted by the United States Beet Sugar Association in a brief which it filed with the Ways and Means Committee. In petitioning for restrictions against the Philippines the association asserted that even with tariff protection against Cuba—

So disproportionate are the benefits of any protective tariff which would place the American farmer on the same basis as the oriental farmer of tropical islands, 7,000 to 11,000 miles away, that the domestic producer can not long continue to meet this competition, even though adequately protected against other foreign nations. (Ways and Means hearings, p. 3333.)

A decline in the sugar industry might easily occur, the association said, no matter how high the tariff wall might be raised by Congress. Even should the barrier be made high enough to compel the production of our entire sugar supply on soil under the American flag, the association frankly admitted, it would be entirely possible that no sugar would be produced in the continental United States, since it could be produced "so much cheaper in the Philippines, and even in Hawaii or Porto Rico."

This hypothesis was based by the spokesmen for the beet industries upon the assumption that insular production can be expanded indefinitely. Whether or not this is true we do not know, but it does seem clear that it can be expanded greatly.

The importance of these facts has not been fully emphasized by the sugar interests, for they have made themselves believe that they would be able to salvage at least something out of the tariff increase if it is granted. They have, for instance, given little attention to the competition of the Hawaiian growers.

Hawaiian production has increased under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law from 562,000 tons in 1922 to 865,000 tons in 1928. The scientific research and enterprising management of the Hawaiian growers makes it probable that their production will continue to increase at least for some time. Hawaiian sugar is refined principally at San Francisco in a Hawaiian refinery, and is distributed throughout the Western States in direct competition with domestic beet sugar. In 1928 over 1,700,000,000 pounds of refined sugar were distributed from San Francisco, probably sufficient to supply the entire area west of the Mississippi River, excepting the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Louisiana, and Texas. It is this region which produces 90 per cent of our domestic beet sugar, so that competition is direct and intense between Hawaiian and beet-sugar producers, both of whom wish to market as much of their sugar as near as possible to the refineries to avoid the freight charges to States farther eastward. No increase in the tariff can alleviate this situation.

On the contrary, an increase in the tariff will enable the Hawaiian growers, who would enjoy an economic advantage irrespective of the tariff, to compete more effectively, giving them greater latitude in making price reductions which the beet-sugar refiners can not meet. The success with which the California & Hawaiian Refinery, owned by Hawaiian planters, is to-day able to undercut the continental refiners was pictured in detail before the Finance Committee by Rudolph Spreckels, himself a California refiner of beet sugar.

Mr. President, I ask permission at this point to insert in the RECORD some excerpts from Mr. Spreckels's testimony in connection with my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts are as follows:

MR. SPRECKELS. I desire to tell you the situation of the Hawaiian-owned refinery. They are operating their refinery in the face of the fact in America we have an overcapacity of 50 per cent in refining, and the only refinery in America that is operating at full capacity is the California & Hawaiian. Every one of the competitors in the industry, mindful of the fact that they should not destroy the industry and those that are in competition with them, have practiced what we call self-regulation.

Let me show you what that means, what advantage these men gain, who, unfortunately, in their selfishness are doing this thing. What does it mean? It means that in operating at full capacity the California & Hawaiian Sugar Co. reduces their cost of producing the refined sugar at least 30 per cent over all of us who are running at half capacity or thereabouts. The overhead and all being counted, they get that advantage and a little more than that. The Hawaiian planters who own this refinery at Crockett, Calif., ship their raw sugar in 100-pound bags to the refinery, and because that sugar comes in duty free the bags are not mutilated by Government sampling and the California & Hawaiian refinery is using that raw-sugar bag to transport its refined sugar, gaining thereby over every sugar refinery in America, both beet and cane, and saving from 8 cents to 9 cents, because we must buy new bags and the beet men must. There is the advantage the Hawaiians have, first through their selfishness in operating in the face of an overcapacity, running at full capacity; they have the advantage because their sugar comes in free of duty and because the plantations owning them have conformed to what is a good practice of their own refinery shipping their product in a bag which the refinery may use and it is used for shipping out the refined sugar, which gives them an advantage of 8 or 9 cents over other refiners.

Now I want to point this out, and I would like the California & Hawaiian people to reply to it. I state that it is a fact that the sugar they refine on the west coast is so large in volume that the population within their legitimate territory can not consume that quantity of sugar. Therefore they are forced to take at least half of that or more—the percentage I can not tell you; I have not the figures before me—and they must ship that far afield into other territories and principally in competition with the beet industry. They go into other territory, in the Chicago market and elsewhere, which we have been told of by people. Of course, they are very active elsewhere in shipping their sugar. Only recently they shipped two cargoes of sugar to New York and entered them into the Bush Terminal and then put it into two barges, an uneconomic condition if there ever was one.

Senator SHORTRIDGE. Shipped it by way of the canal?

Mr. SPRECKELS. Yes, sir.

Senator SMOOT. They shipped the refined sugar?

Mr. SPRECKELS. They shipped the refined sugar; yes, sir; two cargoes, just within the past few weeks.

That kind of competition, where the planters are selling their raw sugar in the form of refined, where they have an advantage in lower

cost of refining and a preferential in the cost of bags, means that they are giving us competition here needlessly of a ruinous character.

I desire to point this out, that any increased duty will simply mean an increased earning by the plantation, any part of which they may contribute to their own refinery to still further reduce the price of refined sugar and the beet sugar and the Louisiana sugar compete not with duty-paid raw but with the price of refined. I maintain here if you put a straight duty on imported raw sugar that we are going to build up the Hawaiian situation so that they can, and probably will, take away any benefit from that tariff that might otherwise accrue to your beet interests and domestic interests on the mainland. Those are concrete facts.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Charges that similar price-cutting tactics had been used by Philippine shippers of sugar to the New York market were made before the House committee by other witnesses.

INCREASED DUTY INEFFICIENT AS A MEANS OF FARM RELIEF

Inadequate as the proposed increase is when considered as a means of assisting the sugar growers of the continental United States, the inefficiency of the increase as a broad measure of farm relief is even more obvious.

The 1925 agricultural census, containing the latest detailed official figures now obtainable, showed that among the 6,371,640 farmers in the United States, only 146,786, or but 2.3 per cent, produced sugar crops of any kind. Department of Agriculture statistics for the years 1923 to 1925 showed that the sugar and sirup crops amounted to only eighty-three one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the total value of farm products in those years. These figures, however, are still too large, for they include not only the commercial beet and cane sugar growers but the maple sugar producers who are not affected by paragraph 501, and many thousands of southern farmers who produce only a slight quantity of cane and molasses for home consumption, and who would continue to do so no matter what the rate which we prescribe may be.

A recent estimate by Dr. Philip G. Wright shows that the total beet and cane acreage in the continental United States and in its insular possessions is only about one-half of 1 per cent of that devoted to the 19 principal agricultural crops. But, no matter what comparison we adopt, it is obvious that the number of farmers benefited by the sugar duty is infinitely smaller than the number burdened by the increase in duty. And to this must be added the fact, well pointed out by Representative FREAR, that "many so-called beet-sugar 'farmers' are landowners who rent their land on indefensible contracts to Mexicans, Bohemians, and others, and are in no sense real farmers or tillers of the soil."

Exact figures showing the number of planters who produce a substantial amount of cane are not available, but we can safely assume that the number is much smaller than that of the beet-sugar growers, inasmuch as the continental production of beet sugar is five or six times as great as that of cane sugar. But the 1925 census of agriculture shows that the farms upon which sugar beets were grown in 1924, a year of normal production, constituted but three-fourths of 1 per cent of the total number of farms, or 47,543 of the total of 6,371,640. Later figures are mere crude approximations, but, with the assistance of data supplied to me by State agricultural commissioners, I wish to submit the following table, which shows the total number of farms in the sugar-beet States, the number growing a crop of sugar beets in 1925, together with the average acreage of beets per farm in that year, and the number of beet growers in 1929, according to the best available estimates:

States	Total farms	Farms reporting sugar beets	Average acreage per farm	Beet growers in 1929
California	136,409	687	95.2	(1)
Colorado	88,020	8,297	24.8	10,500
Idaho	40,592	3,463	11.22	6,844
Illinois	225,601	481	6.7	500
Indiana	195,786	608	10.8	2,250
Iowa	213,490	476	25.6	500
Kansas	165,879	204	35.5	350
Louisiana	132,450	25	14.1	(1)
Michigan	192,327	12,876	8.7	10,000
Minnesota	188,231	1,603	16.2	2,000
Montana	46,904	1,223	26.6	2,052
Nebraska	127,734	1,540	40.0	2,100
New Mexico	31,687	102	13.9	100
North Dakota	75,970	139	18.4	(1)
Ohio	244,703	4,148	11.3	(1)
South Dakota	79,537	63	32.6	460
Utah	25,992	7,561	10.0	4,000
Washington	73,267	214	6.0	335
Wisconsin	193,155	3,010	8.9	1,400
Wyoming	15,512	833	28.3	2,375

¹ No estimate given.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Has the Senator gone into a discussion of that phase where the soil would produce either wheat or beets? In other words, I am inquiring whether he has gone into the question of increasing the beet growth and thus reducing the surplus of wheat and whether it would be profitable or not? That line of argument has been used.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know it has been discussed, but I have not touched upon it in the remarks which I am making to-day. However, I have made some study of it. It comes down largely to an economic question. In many areas, as, for instance, in Wisconsin, the beet acreage is diminishing because there are more profitable crops competing with the sugar-beet crop and therefore the farmers are naturally turning to the more profitable crops. In certain other areas the reverse is true. I find from a study of the situation that the acreage in some States is increasing. No sweeping statement can be made concerning the question which the Senator raises.

Mr. FESS. I thank the Senator and apologize for interrupting him.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I think it is fair to say, as must be apparent, that the change which would come about along the line suggested by the Senator from Ohio, even if the tariff rate is increased and as a result of beet farming being extended compared to the great problem of wheat and other farm crops, would be infinitesimal. It certainly would not have any appreciable effect upon the production of wheat or other crops.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. If the statement of a former Secretary of Agriculture is true that we could add 200,000,000 acres of ground that would produce beets and if that land were appreciably so used, it would have an effect.

Mr. NORRIS. If three-fourths of the land now in wheat were put into sugar beets, it would very materially increase sugar-beet production and reduce wheat production. If we should devote our wheatland to the raising of sugar beets, we would be importing wheat. There is no doubt about it. We can imagine a whole lot of imaginary things by which we might bring about that condition.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would like to say, while we are discussing the possibility of increasing the sugar-beet acreage in the United States, that I had already stated, before the Senator from Ohio came into the Chamber, that the problem is not one of soil and climate as largely as it is a question of labor supply to cultivate the beets and to harvest them, and also the disastrous competition which the industry suffers from the importation of sugar duty free from our insular possessions.

Even on most of the farms I have mentioned the sugar-beet crop was not of primary importance. In all but a few States the average number of acres of beets per farm was less than 20.

Instead of improving the economic status of agriculture, the additional burden imposed upon agriculture by the proposed increase in the sugar duty would be heavier than the net gain to be derived by a small number of farmers. Granting that farm consumption of sugar per capita is probably somewhat less than urban consumption because of the availability of home-grown sugar substitutes and because of a smaller use of confectionery and soft drinks, one may still safely estimate that the sugar consumed on farms amounts to nearly 2,500,000,000 pounds annually. If the additional cost imposed upon the consumer as the result of the tariff is assumed to be 2.3 cents, the farm population in the United States in 1928 was forced to contribute more than \$57,000,000 toward the sugar subsidy. Cane and beet producers secured a benefit of \$43,000,000 from the sugar tariff, leaving a net loss to all farmers of \$14,000,000.

The committee's increase of the rate to 2.2 cents a pound would levy upon the farm population an additional tax of \$13,137,655, making the total sugar tax on agriculture, if present consumption continues, amount to \$70,599,211. If farmers within the continental United States were to receive the full benefit of the proposed duty upon the sugar which they raise, the amount to which they would benefit under the 2.2 cent duty would total \$54,000,000. The net loss to agriculture in general would be \$16,500,000.

The figures to which I have just drawn your attention can leave no doubt that the sugar subsidy is an extremely wasteful method of safeguarding our present continental production of

sugar. But even these figures do not show fully the inadequacy of the proposed increase when considered as a means of benefiting the farmer.

I have not the slightest desire to be unfair to the position taken by the advocates of the increase. Their contention with regard to the effect of the increased duty upon the price received by the farmer is set forth in the following extract from a letter written to me on November 20, 1929, by J. D. Pancake, the secretary of the Mountain States Beet Growers' Marketing Association. Under the standard contract of the Great Western Sugar Co., which he states covers half of the beet-sugar production within the United States, Mr. Pancake says:

Suppose we should be favored by a 1-cent increase in the sugar tariff over the present rate, and sugar should thus net 6 cents instead of 5 cents, what portion of the increase would be reflected in the price of beets to the farmer?

You will kindly find inclosed the contract referred to, in which I have taken sugar netting 5 cents per pound and sugar netting 6 cents per pound, on a 15.5 per cent beet. Let us consult the contract to ascertain the increase of beet prices to the farmer from 5-cent sugar to 6-cent sugar.

By referring to the scale of beet prices, it may be seen that a 5-cent sugar brings the farmer the scale price of \$6.57 per ton, to which must

be added 50 cents bonus or premium for quantity production—and we have always been entitled to the addition of the 50-cent bonus—thus making the beet price \$7.07 per ton.

Again referring to the scale, we find that a 6-cent sugar pays the scale price of \$7.89 plus the 50-cent bonus, making the beet price \$8.39 per ton.

We have now seen that the contract, with sugar netting 5 cents, gives \$7.07 per ton, while the 6-cent sugar in the contract pays the beet farmer \$8.39 per ton. The difference between the beet prices, in the contract, when sugar nets 5 cents and 6 cents is \$1.32 per ton.

A ton of beets testing 15.5 per cent yields 263.92 pounds of granulated sugar—call it 264 pounds. Of course, 264 pounds of sugar is worth \$2.64 more in 6-cent sugar than in 5-cent sugar; but one-half of this is \$1.32 which, we have seen, is exactly the difference in the contract price.

At the conclusion of the extracts from Mr. Pancake's letter, Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a table showing the scale of the prices under the Great Western contract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Average net price received for sugar per 100 pounds	Average per cent sugar in beets sliced, Colorado factories										
	18.0	17.5	17.0	16.5	16.0	15.5	15.0	14.5	14.0	13.5	13.0
\$9.00	\$14.92	\$14.33	\$13.77	\$13.20	\$12.62	\$12.12	\$11.65	\$11.27	\$10.87	\$10.46	\$10.09
\$8.75	14.43	13.86	13.32	12.77	12.22	11.73	11.28	10.91	10.52	10.13	9.76
\$8.50	13.94	13.39	12.87	12.34	11.81	11.35	10.91	10.55	10.17	9.79	9.44
\$8.25	13.45	12.92	12.42	11.92	11.40	10.96	10.54	10.19	9.83	9.46	9.13
\$8.00	12.96	12.45	11.98	11.49	11.00	10.58	10.17	9.83	9.49	9.14	8.81
\$7.75	12.46	11.98	11.53	11.06	10.60	10.19	9.83	9.48	9.15	8.81	8.49
\$7.50	11.97	11.51	11.08	10.63	10.20	9.86	9.51	9.17	8.83	8.49	8.17
\$7.25	11.48	11.05	10.63	10.20	9.86	9.53	9.20	8.86	8.53	8.21	7.88
\$7.00	11.00	10.58	10.19	9.85	9.52	9.20	8.88	8.56	8.24	7.92	7.61
\$6.75	10.52	10.13	9.81	9.50	9.18	8.87	8.56	8.25	7.94	7.64	7.34
\$6.50	10.06	9.75	9.45	9.14	8.84	8.54	8.24	7.95	7.65	7.36	7.06
\$6.25	9.67	9.38	9.08	8.79	8.50	8.21	7.93	7.64	7.36	7.07	6.79
\$6.00	9.28	9.00	8.72	8.44	8.16	7.89	7.61	7.33	7.06	6.79	6.52
\$5.75	8.90	8.63	8.36	8.09	7.82	7.56	7.29	7.03	6.77	6.51	6.26
\$5.50	8.51	8.25	7.99	7.74	7.48	7.23	6.98	6.72	6.50	6.50	6.50
\$5.25	8.12	7.88	7.63	7.39	7.14	6.90	6.66	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
\$5.00	7.74	7.50	7.27	7.03	6.80	6.57	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
\$4.75	7.35	7.13	6.90	6.68	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
\$4.50	6.96	6.75	6.54	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
\$4.25	6.58	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50
\$4.00	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50	6.50

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, granting, for the sake of argument, that all Mr. Pancake says is so, it is necessary to remember that the increase proposed by the Finance Committee amounts not to 1 cent a pound but to less than half a cent a pound, approximately forty-seven one-hundredths of 1 cent if reduced to a refined basis. Referring again to the contract of the Great Western Sugar Co., we find that under the conditions suggested by Mr. Pancake this increase in duty would at the maximum bring the wholesale price of sugar from \$5 a hundred pounds to about \$5.47 a hundred pounds, with the result that the increase per ton in the price received by the farmer would amount to approximately 60 cents a ton.

How much would this actually mean to individual beet growers? Unfortunately, we have no recent figures giving production by farms for individual States, but if we take the average yield of tons of beets per farm within individual States, as shown by the 1925 census of agriculture, we find that the gain per farmer in the principal beet-growing States would be as follows:

California	\$576.36
Colorado	172.62
Idaho	45.12
Illinois	40.56
Indiana	43.74
Iowa	134.16
Kansas	169.32
Michigan	40.44
Minnesota	83.52
Montana	163.44
Nebraska	279.12
New Mexico	36.12
North Dakota	105.66
Ohio	50.28
South Dakota	161.04
Utah	43.50
Washington	23.16
Wisconsin	23.22
Wyoming	168.18

Thus far in considering Mr. Pancake's contention we have been as optimistic as we can be with any degree of reasonable-

ness. No one can contend that the possible benefit to the farmer has been understated. On the other hand, it is necessary to remember that in actual fact a sizeable gain would be made only by a comparatively few large producers, notably in areas such as California, in which much of the beet industry is concentrated upon a small number of large-scale farms. Thousands of smaller-scale farmers would get but a fraction of the sums which I have suggested as the average gain per farm in individual States.

In the second place, the farmer can get his extra 60 cents a ton only if and as long as Cuban exporters do not reduce their prices to meet in part the proposed increase of the tariff, and, what is likely to be more important, only if Hawaiian, Porto Rican, and Philippine cane-sugar growers do not adopt the price-cutting tactics against continental producers which a higher tariff wall would permit.

Still another qualification must be made. We have assumed in the case of the Great Western contract that the sugar extracted will constitute 15.5 per cent of each ton of beets. The percentage actually extracted has been materially lower during the last five years in the States east of Colorado. In Michigan, where the percentage has been higher than in any other major eastern beet-producing State, the 5-year average is but 13.8 per cent, or 276.4 pounds.

I have here the sugar-beet contract of the Michigan Sugar Co., a representative Michigan refining concern, for the beet campaign of 1929. It guarantees the grower 45 per cent of the value of the sugar packed from "an average net ton of all beets received" by the company at its sundry plants. The value of 276.4 pounds of sugar at the 5-cent wholesale price which has prevailed during most of the last year would be \$13.82. Forty-five per cent of this is, roughly, \$6.22 a ton. Were the full amount of the proposed increase in the duty to be effective, the wholesale price of 276.4 pounds would be increased by approximately \$1.30 to a total of \$15.12, with the result that the growers' share on the 45 per cent basis would

increase to \$6.80. But, if I read the contract correctly, it states in paragraph 11 that under all circumstances the minimum price to be paid to the grower shall be \$7.75 a ton, no matter what the wholesale price of sugar may be. Under a contract of this type, which I understand prevails in most of the Middle Western beet areas, not only the proposed increase but a much more substantial increase of the tariff would under existing contract provisions fail to increase by one penny the price received by the farmer for the beets which he has grown. The entire increase would be pocketed by the company operating the beet-sugar refinery.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the appeal which has been made to Senators from sugar-producing States for an increase in the sugar duty. I realize that those Senators are desirous of assisting the farmers who are growing sugar crops, but I believe that a demonstration has been made that the increase in duty will not benefit permanently the producers of sugar in the United States.

We are not justified in placing an enormous increase upon the consumers of sugar in this country when it is apparent that the intended beneficiaries of the duty will not find their industry upon a sound footing. If we could hope to make our sugar crop one self-sufficient for the needs of this country, a stronger argument might be made on behalf of a higher duty on sugar. But even the representatives of the domestic-sugar interests have admitted that we can not hope substantially to increase our proportion of domestically grown sugar.

To adopt the committee amendment will have the following results:

First. A great burden will be placed on the consumer of sugar in the United States.

Second. The benefit to the farmers growing sugar crops will be small.

Third. The farmers as a group will pay more in increased sugar prices than the farmers growing sugar receive through increased prices for their product.

Fourth. The profits of the growers of sugar in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines will be further increased, thus enabling them to compete more disastrously with the growers of sugar within the United States.

Fifth. The proportion of sugar grown within the United States will not be materially increased.

Mr. President, in order to justify the Senate in voting to place a direct tax upon the consumers of sugar in the United States a strong case should be made. I submit that the case for an increase in the duty on sugar is not a strong case; it is a weak case. It is evident, Mr. President, that the sugar duty is inefficient; that it does not accomplish the purposes for which it is intended; and therefore I trust that the amendment proposed by the committee will be rejected.

RECESS

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, January 11, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 10, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, let Thy blessing of approval rest upon the labors of to-day. If any Member is sick or in peril, may he be withdrawn from its danger, and those who are safe may they be maintained in their safety. May the power of Thy truth elevate us and let contentment follow its acquisition. Disclose and make plain the duties that we owe Thee, ourselves, and our country. Do Thou have compassion upon any who may be in the shadows and whose doubts and fears are more than their joys. This day, blessed Lord, help us to gain strength in all those virtues that make us better men. In the holy name of Jesus our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2657. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 21053 relating to the badge of the Daughters of the American Revolution and

S. 2675. An act to extend the times for commencing the construction of a bridge across Santa Rosa Sound, Fla.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. GREENE and Mr. FLETCHER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the War Department.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the rules pension business is in order to-day. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] has kindly consented to defer his speech until we dispose of this bill. Do I understand that he will not lose his rights?

The SPEAKER. He will not.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin withhold for a moment until I make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I will.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would like to ask unanimous consent for leave to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I would like a minute and a half.

Mr. RANKIN. On what subject?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I want to make an announcement to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for a minute and a half, following the gentleman from Michigan. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the press this morning very generally carries news stories giving the country to understand that the House of Representatives will not go along with the President in his program for statutory changes he deems necessary for most efficient handling of the problem of Federal prohibition enforcement by his administration. That impression is grossly erroneous. This House has great confidence in the sincerity, the resolution, and the executive capacity of President Hoover. [Applause.] This House stands for enforcement of all law, including the eighteenth amendment. [Applause.] This House desires and intends to give the President the legislative program he desires with reference to Federal prohibition enforcement and to give him the appropriations that he desires to carry out his program of enforcement. [Applause.] This House is overwhelmingly dry and I am satisfied I correctly judge its sentiment in this. More than that, there is a liberal percentage of wets who are for enforcement of every law and who will continue to manifest that in the future as they have in the past.

What is to be the procedure in the House in consideration of this program of legislation, whether through a special committee or whether through one or more regular committees, is not so material. There is a program that the President desires from Congress with reference to prohibition enforcement. That program must and will be approved speedily by the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan states that he is ready, and so are we. Now is the time to show your strength. Go to it!

I want to call the attention of the House to page 3 of the Washington Herald of a statement by a Coast Guard officer, referring to "foreign" rum ships. The officer is quoted as saying:

I ordered shots fired into the air to warn the *George Washington*, and at the same time sent the following radio message:

"Proceed with extreme caution. Three foreign rum ships operating without lights in the steamer lane."

She cut off her engines and went cautiously through the area where the rum ships were deploying to escape us. The *Bremen* was coming along behind and got through without any trouble.

Now, turn to page 2 and see what took place on the American ship *George Washington*:

ABOARD S. S. "GEORGE WASHINGTON," AT SEA, January 9 (U. P.).—There'll be plenty of good 12 per cent authoritative beer aboard ship by Saturday. This information was divulged to-night by the amiable steward.

The machinery which makes it possible to have the beer was put into operation to-day, and the first batch is to be ready for thirsty passengers and others by Saturday. It is planned to prepare 33 barrels on the voyage. The price is 15 cents a glass.

Mr. Speaker, prosit! [Laughter.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] has called attention to the fact that we will support the President in his program for the enforcement of all law, including the eighteenth amendment, and he calls attention to an article published this morning in the press. As I read that it means nothing except that this House, as constituted and organized through its committees, is able to legislate and transact the business of the Nation and to carry out the recommendations of the Executive. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House, to which most of the legislation affecting prohibition comes, has united, practically unanimously, in bringing forth legislation that the Executive has asked, and the bills to which the gentleman now makes reference and which the President wants passed, and that are pending before that committee, will receive the earliest possible consideration, and favorable report will be made upon them to this House to the end that the President may be able to enforce the law as he sees fit, he being charged with that responsibility under the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not speaking for the committee, is he?

Mr. DYER. I speak for a great majority of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

AMBASSADOR TO POLAND

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for a few moments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have secured this time to urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 132, introduced by my friend and colleague, the Hon. HAMILTON FISH, of New York, authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Poland; that is, raising the status of the relationship between our two countries from that of minister to ambassadorship.

I have read the complete record of the controversy on this subject between different members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the executive department, the Senate, and former Secretaries of State. Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the controversies. I am interested in promoting the friendship between two great peoples, the United States of America and the Republic of Poland. I have not the time to-day, and in my judgment it would be superfluous, to recall to your mind the long-standing friendship between the Polish people and our country. I have but to remind you of the distinguished and valiant services of two great Polish patriots, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Gen. Casimir Pulaski. As you know, General Kosciuszko was the engineer who built the defenses at West Point during the Revolutionary War and General Pulaski was the Polish patriot who was killed at the Battle of Savannah. These and other Polish citizens have assisted in welding the strong bond of friendship between the Polish and American peoples for the last 150 years.

As you know, the Republic of Poland stands fifth among the European nations in population and that there is no nation in Europe which has manifested a more cordial and friendly feeling toward the United States than has Poland. As I said above, I am not interested in the controversy. I have read the Diplomatic Code and particularly article 31, referring to restrictions against the creation of new ambassadorships which reads:

That no new ambassadorship shall be created unless the same shall be provided for by act of Congress.

I feel competent to speak upon this subject, not only because I have made it a study and have familiarized myself with the history of these two great nations but I am urging the passage of this resolution because of the personal knowledge gained from a friendship with distinguished Polish-American citizens of my own home city. I believe that the Polish element in our national life has been one of the principal factors in assisting the United States in securing its enviable position as the leading nation of the world to-day. A large percentage of the people of Toledo are Polish descendants, and I can say from personal knowledge of their citizenship and political activities that they are a great people, and that it is only fair and just that the

United States of America should recognize their fatherland as a leading world power in exchanging ambassadors instead of ministers.

I therefore urge the Members of the House to speedily pass this resolution authorizing the President of the United States to appoint an ambassador to the Republic of Poland at a salary of \$17,500 per annum.

PENSIONS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7960) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls up an omnibus pension bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. My purpose in rising at this time is to ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions what the policy of the committee is, generally speaking, in the award of pensions to widows and old soldiers of the Civil War still surviving, so that the membership of the House may have some general line to follow in the introduction of private bills, particularly as to the range of amount of pensions the committee is going to follow in the award of increased rates of pensions to the deserving widows and the few surviving old soldiers.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think I can say for the committee that it is going to be very liberal in dealing with increase of pensions in deserving cases. The war is long past, and the soldiers and their widows are fast dying. While we shall scan each bill carefully under the rules, the disposition is to treat the Members very liberally in the consideration of bills.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not question the attitude of the committee, but I want to ascertain what the range of pay is that the committee is going to follow in awarding increase of pensions. What is the policy of the committee? Certainly the committee has some stipulated scale for the increase of pensions.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. As constituted under the law and under the rules, and the gentleman will find that we will adhere strictly to the law and the rules.

Mr. STAFFORD. But you are not adhering to the law in this bill.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The rules, particularly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman be willing to incorporate in his remarks just what the scale of increase is, so that Members may have the opportunity of seeing it?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. The clerk of the committee has made this concise summarized statement:

When the widow of a Civil War veteran has no title to pension under existing laws and complies to the rules of evidence as herein inserted, and has attained the age of 60 years, the rate of pension recommended is \$30 per month. If she has not attained the age of 60 years, the rate of pension recommended is \$20 per month.

When a widow of a Civil War veteran is receiving a pension under existing laws and the evidence submitted in support of the private bill indicates that she requires the regular or constant aid and attendance of another person due to physical or mental disability or has attained the age of 78 years, the rate of pension recommended is \$50 per month, provided she does not have excessive property rights or an annual net income of \$500 or more exclusive of her pension.

When a widow is pensioned under existing laws at the rate of \$30 per month and has no title to the \$40 per month rate because she has not attained the age of 75 years and the evidence submitted in support of the bill shows that she does not require the regular and constant aid or attendance of another person, but because of disabilities she is unfitted to earn a livelihood, the rate of pension recommended would be \$40 per month, provided she does not have excessive property rights and has little or no income aside from her pension.

No increase will be made beyond the \$30 per month rate to a widow of a Civil War veteran whose name is now on the pension roll by special act of Congress.

For more detailed information consult the rules of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not had access to a copy of the rules.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I shall be glad to set them out fully in the Record.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES—COMMITTEE ON
INVALID PENSIONS—SEVENTY-FIRST CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ROOMS, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOMS 304-304A, TELE-
PHONE 604

John M. Nelson, of Wisconsin, chairman; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; Edward M. Beers, of Pennsylvania; Edgar R. Kless, of Pennsylvania; Daniel A. Reed, of New York; Frank L. Bowman, of West Virginia; Frederick W. Magrady, of Pennsylvania; Katherine G. Langley, of Kentucky; Conrad G. Selvig, of Minnesota; David Hopkins, of Missouri; Oscar De Priest, of Illinois; Elva R. Kendall, of Kentucky; Francis Seiberling, of Ohio; W. I. Nolan, of Minnesota; Mell G. Underwood, of Ohio; Ralph F. Lozier, of Missouri; Arthur H. Greenwood, of Indiana; Andrew L. Somers, of New York; James M. Fitzpatrick, of New York; Joe L. Smith, of West Virginia.

Bingham W. Mathias, clerk; Norman E. Ives, examiner.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittee No. 1: Mr. Elliott, Indiana, chairman; Mr. Underwood, Ohio; Mr. Magrady, Pennsylvania.

States: Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Utah, Georgia, New Mexico, New Jersey, Louisiana, Alabama, and Oregon.

Subcommittee No. 2: Mr. Beers, Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. Lozier, Missouri; Mrs. Langley, Kentucky.

States: Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Delaware, Texas, Arizona, Florida, and District of Columbia.

Subcommittee No. 3: Mr. Kless, Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. Greenwood, Indiana; Mr. Selvig, Minnesota.

States: Minnesota, Vermont, Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Maine, Tennessee, and Insular Possessions.

Subcommittee No. 4: Mr. Reed, New York, chairman; Mr. Somers, New York; Mr. Hopkins, Missouri.

States: New York, Wisconsin, Montana, Rhode Island, South Dakota, North Dakota, Idaho, Washington, Michigan, and Nebraska.

Subcommittee No. 5: Mr. Bowman, West Virginia, chairman; Mr. Fitzpatrick, New York; Mr. De Priest, Illinois.

States: West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Colorado, Wyoming, California, Nevada, Oklahoma, and Arkansas.

Subcommittee on general bills: Mr. Nelson, Wisconsin, chairman; Mr. Underwood, Ohio; Mr. Elliott, Indiana.

PREFACE

The number of bills referred to this committee the past two years has been in such volume as to make it impossible to give consideration to more than a fraction of the whole. Hundreds of claims came to this committee in the past that were manifestly apparent to the most casual observer as not within former committee rules, all of which occupy an undue amount of the time and energy of the office force, to the detriment and delay of meritorious claims. A large percentage of bills are also accompanied with only partially completed evidence, which invariably militates against the consideration of claims presented wherein the evidence is complete.

That the work of the committee may be expedited the following rules have been adopted, and which will hereafter be strictly adhered to:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

Soldiers' claims

RULE 1. (a) All ex-soldiers of the Civil War who rendered 90 days or more actual service and were honorably discharged from all contracts of service now have title to pension under existing laws at a rate in excess of the maximum rate allowed by this committee.

No claim for increase in a soldier's pension will be considered who is now pensioned under general laws.

(b) Claims wherein it is shown by the official records (a report from the records of The Adjutant General, War Department) that applicant rendered not less than 80 days' actual service will be given favorable consideration, provided a copy of the bill is accompanied by a report from The Adjutant General, War Department, showing the period of his service and an honorable discharge from at least one contract of his service, four affidavits on forms furnished by this committee, and satisfactory evidence showing that the applicant is identical with the soldier of record; otherwise the claim will be laid aside and notice given the Representative introducing the bill. The maximum rate allowed by this committee in claims of this character will be \$50 a month.

[NOTE.—If the applicant has had his claim rejected at the Bureau of Pensions, a report from the official records will be waived.]

State militiamen

RULE 2. Those whose service was in a State organization only, during the Civil War, have no title to pension under existing laws. The claims of all such will be given consideration only when a copy of the bill is accompanied by an official report from the records of the Comptroller General's office showing a service of 80 days or more with the Federal Army, and that the State was reimbursed for applicant's service by the United States. The bill and official report must also be accompanied by four affidavits on forms to be supplied by this committee, and satisfactory evidence to show that the applicant is identical

with the soldier mentioned in the official report of the Comptroller General.

The claims of widows of such soldiers will be given consideration if accompanied by the same class of evidence, including evidence establishing legal widowhood, as indicated in section (f), Rule 4.

Contract surgeons, telegraphers, scouts, and guides

RULE 3. Claims for contract surgeons, telegraphers, scouts, and guides will be given favorable consideration only when a copy of bill is accompanied by an official report from the records of The Adjutant General, War Department, and the office of the Comptroller General, showing appointment by competent authority, actual service of six months or more, and an honorable severance from the service.

In addition to such official reports, it will be required that all evidence necessary to complete the claim accompany a copy of the bill, as indicated in section (b), Rule 1.

No claims of other alleged soldiers, or their widows, such as civilian employees, including teamsters, wagon men, bakers, cooks, and quartermaster clerks, will be considered by this committee.

Widows' claims

RULE 4. (a) All legal widows of Civil War soldiers who rendered 90 days or more military service and were honorably discharged from all contracts of service, or, if service was for less than 90 days and the official records show he was discharged on a surgeon's certificate of disability—the disability having been contracted in service and line of duty—have title to pension under existing laws at the rate of \$30 a month if married to the soldier prior to June 27, 1905, and \$50 a month under the act of July 3, 1926, if married to the soldier prior to or during the period of his service during the Civil War.

(c) No increase in a widow's claim beyond the \$50 rate will be entertained or considered except in cases where the applicant is now pensioned at \$50 a month, or is shown to have title to that rate under section (b) of this rule, and has dependent upon her a helpless and dependent son or daughter of the soldier, which son or daughter is shown to have a pensionable status under rule 6. Under these conditions a widow's pension may be increased to \$70 a month, to include \$20 a month to the helpless and dependent son or daughter.

(d) No claim for increase from the \$30 rate in widows' claims will be allowed whose name is now on the pension roll by special act of Congress.

(e) Claims of widows who were legally married to their soldier husbands subsequent to June 27, 1905, and prior to June 27, 1915, will be given a pensionable status if shown by satisfactory evidence that the applicant is the legal widow of the soldier; that it be shown by competent testimony that she lived with the soldier from the date of their marriage to the date of his death; and by medical testimony that she is unable to contribute to her own support, and is in such physical or mental condition as to require periodical aid and attendance of another person; and that she is without means, a home, or income from any source.

(f) In all proposed claims coming within section (e) of this rule applicants must, before presenting a claim to this committee, establish legal widowhood at the Bureau of Pensions, to be determined by official correspondence with the Commissioner of Pensions, and in the event the soldier husband was not a pensioner and the commissioner reports legal widowhood has not been established at the Bureau of Pensions, the following-named evidence must accompany the bill:

A certified copy of the marriage record.

A certified copy of the soldier's death record.

An official report from the records of the War Department showing that the soldier husband rendered 80 days' or more military service and was honorably discharged.

Evidence to show that applicant's husband was identical with the soldier named in the official report.

Record evidence showing dissolution, by death or divorce, of all former contracts of marriage of the soldier and of the claimant.

All of the above-indicated evidence must be accompanied by four affidavits on forms supplied by this committee.

This committee will not hereafter undertake to establish the question of legal widowhood in any case, but will lay aside all claims not completed in accordance with the provisions of sections (e) and (f) of this rule and notice given to the Representative introducing the bill.

(g) The rate of pension in all claims coming within the meaning of rule 4, sections (e) and (f), will be \$20 a month for those who have not attained the age of 60 years and \$30 a month for all who are 60 years or more of age.

(h) No claims of an applicant will be allowed who has been divorced from her soldier husband unless a second contract of marriage has been entered into between them subsequent to June 27, 1905, and prior to June 27, 1915.

(i) No claim of an applicant will be allowed if the evidence shows that either the soldier or the applicant had a living undivorced wife or husband at the date of the soldier's death, unless it be shown the former wife or husband is deceased, and unless it be definitely shown in a sworn statement by claimant, corroborated by two or more credible

witnesses, that she had no knowledge during the soldier's lifetime of the barrier to a legal marriage with him.

(j) A soldier's widow whose name has been dropped from the pension roll on account of her remarriage, and such contract of marriage, or any subsequent marriages, are dissolved on the husband's application for cause other than desertion, her name will not be restored to the roll.

In the event the contract of marriage has been dissolved by decree of divorce, on application of the husband, on the ground of desertion, favorable action may be taken and a recommendation that applicant's name be restored to the pension roll at the rate of \$30 a month, provided the bill is accompanied by evidence to complete the claim, as follows:

A certified copy of the husband's petition showing cause of action and a certified copy of the decree of divorce, and four affidavits on forms supplied by this committee.

A sworn statement by claimant, accompanied by the testimony of two or more witnesses, setting forth all the facts and circumstances justifying her desertion of the husband, will be required.

RULE 5. The name of a soldier's widow will not be placed on the pension roll if she has been denied pension, or whose name has been dropped from the roll under the provisions of the act of August 7, 1882.

Sons and daughters

RULE 6. This committee will consider the claim of a helpless son or daughter of a deceased soldier who was a pensioner at the time of his death, only when the bill is accompanied by evidence on blanks furnished by this committee to show:

(a) That he or she has been a helpless and dependent person since prior to the age of 16 years.

(b) That he or she has never contracted marriage.

(c) That he or she is the legitimate son or daughter of the soldier.

(d) That he or she is now in a condition to require regular aid and attendance of another person or is blind, insane, or idiotic.

(e) That he or she is without means, a home, or income, and is dependent on others not legally bound to his or her support for sustenance and shelter.

(f) The rate of pension recommended will be \$20 a month.

(g) In the event the helpless or dependent son or daughter lives with and is supported by the mother, who is pensioned as the soldier's widow, the bill must provide for the increase in the mother's (widow's) pension to include \$20 for the use and benefit of the helpless son or daughter. This evidence is to be furnished on forms supplied by this committee.

RULE 7. Bills proposing to pension brothers and sisters of deceased soldiers are not admissible.

RULE 8. These rules are intended to apply to all applicants for pension or increase of pension of officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps, except that evidence of an official character must be obtained through the Navy Department.

The committee, in promulgating these rules, has endeavored to indicate as clearly as possible the class of claims that will, as well as those that will not, receive consideration, and has attempted to show in detail the character of evidence required in each class of claims. All claims not completed in accordance with these rules will not be sent to the examiner's desk.

JOHN M. NELSON, *Chairman*.

BINGHAM W. MATHIAS, *Clerk*.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have some requests for the introduction of private bills and I want to know what the policy of the committee is toward increases.

Mr. SABATH. And that information will be appreciated by a great majority of the members, because they do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am rising for that purpose. This is the first pension bill that we have considered, and I make this request so that the membership of the House may know generally the policy of the committee toward increases.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. We are about to consider some amendments to these rules, and as soon as they are agreed upon by the committee we will have a supply printed and send a copy to each Member. The gentleman can get these rules at the committee room at any time.

Mr. SABATH. I know that the gentleman is fair and feels that the membership should have all the information that it is entitled to. We receive many applications and requests from time to time.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. If the gentleman desires, I should be very glad to ask unanimous consent that the rules be printed as a part of my remarks.

Mr. SABATH. I would, of course, not object, and I would appreciate and welcome that information.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman have printed the rules governing the matters of the later widows?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is all in the rules.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. That is in the rules now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman say that the committee adheres very closely to those rules, or does it make exceptions?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Exceptions are made very rarely. I do not know of any clear-cut exceptions. There are places that are close to the line, and we consider such case, giving the benefit of the equities to the claimant.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is rather early in the session for an omnibus pension bill to be introduced. Does this bill incorporate the private bills of all of the Members of the House, or what is its scope?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. This covers all bills that were introduced prior to the date this omnibus bill was reported to the House in which it was possible to have the claims reviewed and reports written.

Mr. STAFFORD. So that there is virtually nothing now pending before the committee not covered in this bill?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Every day we get many bills, but we try to keep up to date.

Mr. STAFFORD. Years back the committee followed a rule that they would only grant to Members one or two private bills for incorporation in omnibus bills. I understand now that the policy is to incorporate all bills where good cases are shown in conformance to the rules laid down by the committee?

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. I am very glad to have the gentleman ask that question. It has given me some concern. I know the rule was that there was somewhat of an equitable arrangement, but for the last three or four years it has been found that it is better to consider all bills that are meritorious, and where there are evidences in existence, not trying to apportion to each Member a certain number, and so the committee will try to deal with these bills irrespective of the number that each Member has, until that becomes unworkable.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the committee:

H. R. 263. Maggie A. Broomall.	H. R. 679. Nancy M. Hinkley.
H. R. 265. Mary Conover.	H. R. 688. Fidelity Hale.
H. R. 266. Catherine T. Gardener.	H. R. 690. Essie E. Whiteside.
H. R. 272. Josephine Way.	H. R. 691. Sherman H. Wharton.
H. R. 275. Katharine M. Thomas.	H. R. 696. Fannie Bemis.
H. R. 276. Emeline Beaton.	H. R. 747. Nellie Manion.
H. R. 277. Mary J. Toomey.	H. R. 748. Abbie Osborn.
H. R. 278. Mary E. H. Wetzel.	H. R. 749. Phebe J. Rice.
H. R. 280. Elizabeth A. Bitting.	H. R. 750. Sarah Stewart.
H. R. 282. Elizabeth A. Deaver.	H. R. 751. Susan E. Sullivan.
H. R. 283. Amanda Eppley.	H. R. 754. Hester Wilson.
H. R. 284. Rachel A. Rickabaugh.	H. R. 755. Etta McCreary.
H. R. 285. Sarah M. Wilson.	H. R. 756. William Phillips.
H. R. 286. Mary C. Connelley.	H. R. 760. Laura McWilliams.
H. R. 287. Maggie E. Shearer.	H. R. 792. Emma Carman.
H. R. 288. Sarah Ann Bortell.	H. R. 793. Nancy Cardwell.
H. R. 290. Mary E. Smith.	H. R. 801. Sarah E. Bogue.
H. R. 291. Sarah E. Wildman.	H. R. 802. Emma Day.
H. R. 301. Edith Curran.	H. R. 806. Adelaide F. Thomas.
H. R. 306. Miles A. Williams.	H. R. 809. Elizabeth R. Kinney.
H. R. 307. Frances A. Houston.	H. R. 821. Bessie Wilson.
H. R. 308. Sarah Coleman.	H. R. 822. John Grisham.
H. R. 310. Florence Huddleston.	H. R. 823. Thirsa Belle Cain.
H. R. 311. Eliza Trower.	H. R. 825. Perry C. Brown.
H. R. 313. Asa T. Fowler.	H. R. 826. Lydia A. Crouch.
H. R. 314. Alice F. Pritchett.	H. R. 832. Jennie M. Hill.
H. R. 344. Ann Smith.	H. R. 846. Edith Pearl McCain.
H. R. 347. Anna L. Selvers.	H. R. 852. Lizzie Gasaway.
H. R. 353. Sarah J. Collins.	H. R. 853. Olive Craig.
H. R. 363. Charlotte B. Williamson.	H. R. 854. Annie Groves.
H. R. 365. Louisa M. Crissey.	H. R. 856. Jefferson Jackson.
H. R. 367. Catherine Campbell.	H. R. 857. Mary E. Schofield.
H. R. 368. Mary E. Buffin.	H. R. 858. Sarah Vickers.
H. R. 369. Mary Jane Stahl.	H. R. 860. Belle Lowry.
H. R. 372. Mary J. Mitchell.	H. R. 869. Cordie E. Zufall.
H. R. 373. Jane Smith.	H. R. 871. Maria L. Summa.
H. R. 375. Mary E. Opdycke.	H. R. 872. Sarah C. Newel.
H. R. 382. Ella R. Dansbery.	H. R. 873. Phebe W. Litman.
H. R. 388. Melissa Smith.	H. R. 874. Eliza J. Jaquett.
H. R. 404. Josephine Mickle.	H. R. 875. Eliza Forney.
H. R. 405. Florence Reed.	H. R. 876. Emma Evans.
H. R. 407. Nannie A. Gooch.	H. R. 877. Anna E. Ellenberger.
H. R. 408. Effie E. Carr.	H. R. 878. Mary H. Crookham.
H. R. 411. Carrie M. Jackson.	H. R. 879. Ida B. Casebeer.
H. R. 415. Caroline F. Sroufe.	H. R. 880. Minerva J. Carrell.
H. R. 434. Anna Lozier.	H. R. 881. Ellen O. Berkey.
H. R. 435. Amelia McCray.	H. R. 882. Delilah Stevens.
H. R. 439. Florence L. Stonebarger.	H. R. 883. Lucinda M. Chrise.
H. R. 440. Carrie L. Warner.	H. R. 891. William R. Burger.
H. R. 536. Minnie C. Henn.	H. R. 892. Lovina Bryant.
H. R. 537. Evan Frogge, alias Edward W. Frogge.	H. R. 893. Bertha Gokey.
H. R. 554. Nancy Malchi.	H. R. 894. Catherine Whitmore.
H. R. 569. Pauline Bartlett.	H. R. 899. Justina Swartz.
H. R. 594. Albertina Champion.	H. R. 900. Susannah Null.
H. R. 617. Armina Besaw.	H. R. 901. Hannah A. Muntz.
H. R. 623. Susan E. Young.	H. R. 902. Annie Pecher.
H. R. 624. Sarah Raybuck.	H. R. 904. Elizabeth Gray.
H. R. 627. Bell L. Duncan.	H. R. 911. Susan Rensford.
H. R. 628. Susie A. Courson.	H. R. 912. Fannie Snyder.
H. R. 630. Pauline Carney.	H. R. 927. Grace M. McOmber.
H. R. 631. Sarah J. Alabran.	H. R. 929. Catherine Connolly.
H. R. 632. Enolia McCullough.	H. R. 930. Mary E. Torpy.
H. R. 632. Sadie Parris.	H. R. 932. Ella F. Marsters.
H. R. 633. Elizabeth L. Steffy.	H. R. 934. Emma L. Lewis.
H. R. 652. Belle Seward.	H. R. 935. Mary A. Phillips.
H. R. 652. Harriet Marshall.	H. R. 945. Deborah Sebring.
	H. R. 946. Tamsen Yorgey.

- H. R. 947. Louisa Flack.
H. R. 948. Clara E. Deuel.
H. R. 950. Suprema Gatehouse.
H. R. 1027. Anna M. Varnum.
H. R. 1033. Sabra Harrison.
H. R. 1034. Sevilla Ambrose.
H. R. 1061. Fannie F. Godfrey.
H. R. 1079. Permelia J. Long.
H. R. 1089. Mary R. Proud.
H. R. 1096. Laura G. Chipman.
H. R. 1097. Sarah S. Whitney.
H. R. 1100. Effie R. Rice.
H. R. 1101. Charlotte McCartney.
H. R. 1106. Lucy Jenkins.
H. R. 1107. Rebecca Morrow.
H. R. 1116. Elizabeth Hartinger.
H. R. 1117. Anna Horton.
H. R. 1119. Catharine Hutchison.
H. R. 1120. Maywood Spence.
H. R. 1125. Elizabeth Birchfield.
H. R. 1130. Laura Lambert.
H. R. 1131. Ella Dean.
H. R. 1133. Dora Stark.
H. R. 1140. Sarah J. Waddell.
H. R. 1141. Elizabeth V. Noble.
H. R. 1142. Sarah M. Wheeler.
H. R. 1143. Susan E. Wensel.
H. R. 1144. Fannie Valentine.
H. R. 1145. Elizabeth J. Spicer.
H. R. 1146. Luthena E. Cook.
H. R. 1147. Maria L. Agon.
H. R. 1148. Katie Currier.
H. R. 1149. Emily A. Day.
H. R. 1150. Fanny MacLain.
H. R. 1151. Lillie Eggsware.
H. R. 1152. Mary Ellen Hogle.
H. R. 1153. Frankie A. Willis.
H. R. 1161. Ellen E. Hart.
H. R. 1162. Martha J. Templeton.
H. R. 1168. Eliza J. Johnson.
H. R. 1170. Celiata Wells.
H. R. 1171. Elizabeth Gibson.
H. R. 1254. Louisa M. Beaver.
H. R. 1255. Lydia A. Stees.
H. R. 1259. Louise C. Staples.
H. R. 1261. Mary E. Koogle.
H. R. 1262. Mary E. Stubbs.
H. R. 1263. Bethena Mills.
H. R. 1264. Mary S. Young.
H. R. 1265. Rocella Jones.
H. R. 1267. Jennie S. Faris.
H. R. 1268. Sarah J. Cline.
H. R. 1271. Amy Hoppes.
H. R. 1272. Harriet E. Arrasmith.
H. R. 1274. Sarah C. Morton.
H. R. 1275. Jennie Minnick.
H. R. 1276. Eliza M. Toomire.
H. R. 1277. Mary S. Bennett.
H. R. 1278. Catherine H. Forbes.
H. R. 1280. Adelia Shiers.
H. R. 1284. Ida Henderson.
H. R. 1286. Phoebe R. G. Strong.
H. R. 1288. Bridget Fallon.
H. R. 1289. Lina Salter.
H. R. 1290. Elvira Foster.
H. R. 1291. Margaret B. Lincoln.
H. R. 1296. Abbie M. Stout.
H. R. 1308. Rachel A. Moffatt.
H. R. 1315. Mary Stout.
H. R. 1321. Adanijah Jordan, alias Adonijah Jordan, alias A. D. Jordan, alias A. D. Jurden, alias A. D. Jourdan.
H. R. 1326. Lucetta J. Smith.
H. R. 1328. Lou M. Hoover.
H. R. 1329. Matilda A. Hammond.
H. R. 1330. Gilla A. Hall.
H. R. 1337. Nancy Jane Ward.
H. R. 1347. Harriet Stanton.
H. R. 1357. Celena L. Palmer.
H. R. 1358. Ola Baker.
H. R. 1361. Anna H. Niesz.
H. R. 1362. Lucy Ann Smith.
H. R. 1364. Elizabeth Carter.
H. R. 1365. Ida May Eastman.
H. R. 1368. Laura Jane Dehnen.
H. R. 1369. Mary E. Glaspy.
H. R. 1371. Agnes Haddox.
H. R. 1372. Elizabeth A. McAdoo.
H. R. 1373. Mary Jane Outcalt.
H. R. 1374. Margaret A. Rudolph.
H. R. 1376. Anna E. Antle.
H. R. 1375. Anna Hicks.
H. R. 1426. Albert O. Yonaka.
H. R. 1427. Frances Bull.
H. R. 1435. Louisiana J. Swearingen.
H. R. 1443. Lucinda McChesney.
H. R. 1450. Martha J. Misner.
H. R. 1454. Mary Wiley.
H. R. 1455. Lucy J. Goodrick.
H. R. 1456. Mary Curtis.
H. R. 1458. Julia A. Hobson.
H. R. 1460. Ellen Barrett.
H. R. 1461. Candace J. Carr.
H. R. 1462. Anne P. Love.
H. R. 1463. Georgia Cavinus.
H. R. 1464. Sarah Sexton.
H. R. 1467. Ella May Chappell.
H. R. 1468. Elizabeth Tetwiler.
H. R. 1469. Blanche Hollingshead.
H. R. 1470. Susannah Brubaker.
H. R. 1471. Mary E. Hammer.
H. R. 1474. Elizabeth Gummo.
H. R. 1475. Catharine Johnston.
H. R. 1503. Addie R. Graves.
H. R. 1519. Stanley Eugene Spear.
H. R. 1522. Ann C. Guthrie.
H. R. 1523. Martha Hicks.
H. R. 1541. Emma B. Fleming.
H. R. 1543. Elizabeth B. Hertzler.
H. R. 1550. Minerva J. Hays.
H. R. 1552. Belle E. Richards.
H. R. 1553. Sarah C. Stoner.
H. R. 1556. Nancy E. Baker.
H. R. 1557. Annie M. Kinsel.
H. R. 1558. Susan Miller.
H. R. 1589. Altha Jewett Atterberry.
H. R. 1597. Susie Zook.
H. R. 1598. Elizabeth C. Jacobs.
H. R. 1599. Lucy Ann Hoffman.
H. R. 1613. Alice H. Dean.
H. R. 1618. Thomas J. Marshall.
H. R. 1620. Katherine Zachman.
H. R. 1626. Hannah Mikesell.
H. R. 1629. Martha A. Harvey.
H. R. 1633. Hannah Woods.
H. R. 1634. Margaret R. Wiant.
H. R. 1636. Rachel M. Gilmore.
H. R. 1637. Josephine Fox.
H. R. 1683. Jennie A. Work.
H. R. 1685. Eliza J. McCoy.
H. R. 1687. Addie Daniels.
H. R. 1688. Mary J. Pierce.
H. R. 1692. Emma M. Homan.
H. R. 1727. Sarah E. Campbell.
H. R. 1728. Mary J. Coddington.
H. R. 1729. Maria A. Finnegan.
H. R. 1733. Mary L. Stock.
H. R. 1734. Mary E. Clark.
H. R. 1735. Eliza K. D. Mann.
H. R. 1736. Fannie C. Percival.
H. R. 1740. Fannie E. Hall.
H. R. 1741. Anna M. Smurr.
H. R. 1742. Mary Kariger.
H. R. 1776. Wilber Green.
H. R. 1778. Minnie L. Klock.
H. R. 1779. Lena Kircher.
H. R. 1784. Frances M. Myers.
H. R. 1785. Porter Mayo.
H. R. 1786. Elizabeth C. Jackson.
H. R. 1787. Caroline C. Cassidy.
H. R. 1790. Rosanna Lyon.
H. R. 1795. Emma J. Duncan.
H. R. 1796. Archie Harrington.
H. R. 1832. Alice A. Switzer.
H. R. 1833. Ruth E. Tope.
H. R. 1844. Kittie E. Farr.
H. R. 1849. Elizabeth Caulk.
H. R. 1853. Annie E. Carson.
H. R. 1854. Bertha R. Baer.
H. R. 1855. Mary T. Johnson.
H. R. 1859. Marie E. Schubardt.
H. R. 1860. Mary E. Jacobus.
H. R. 1862. Cecelia F. Mausell.
H. R. 1863. Jean H. Kitchel.
H. R. 1864. Susie E. Briggs.
H. R. 1870. Dorothy Sampson.
H. R. 1871. Lieucettia J. Smith.
H. R. 1873. Harriet Durham.
H. R. 1874. Emma T. Saunders.
H. R. 1901. Caroline Carleton.
H. R. 1902. William G. Munro, alias William Monroe.
H. R. 1903. Fred E. Craine.
H. R. 1905. Savina Stump.
H. R. 1906. Telitha C. Harvey.
H. R. 1934. Helen Windsor.
H. R. 1935. Marietta R. Burgoyne.
H. R. 1939. Alex Rice, alias Alexander M. Rice.
H. R. 1940. Deborah M. Race.
H. R. 1949. Joseph Little.
H. R. 1950. Benjamin F. Ramey, alias B. F. Ramey.
H. R. 1951. James Deaton.
H. R. 1952. Mary Grine.
H. R. 1958. Helen Payne.
H. R. 1960. Mary Jane Stead.
H. R. 1962. Susan C. Phelps.
H. R. 1967. Harriett Wheaton.
H. R. 2000. Mealy Glancey.
H. R. 2010. Catherine Weatherston.
H. R. 2012. Amanda Reber.
H. R. 2045. Elizabeth Thomas.
H. R. 2050. Nancy H. Cunningham.
H. R. 2051. May Graham.
H. R. 2052. Margery Guy.
H. R. 2060. Elizabeth Davis.
H. R. 2062. Mary L. Briggs.
H. R. 2063. Mary J. Matha.
H. R. 2064. Jane Nobbs.
H. R. 2065. Lenora Powell.
H. R. 2067. Lovinna Nichols.
H. R. 2070. Naomi Follett.
H. R. 2074. Lucy F. Davis.
H. R. 2084. Eliza J. Bullock.
H. R. 2085. John E. W. Todd.
H. R. 2091. Emily Wheeler.
H. R. 2101. Nettie Rose.
H. R. 2102. Della Sego.
H. R. 2105. Lucy A. Royal.
H. R. 2106. Frances A. Reed.
H. R. 2107. Mary M. Collier.
H. R. 2108. Almada J. McBride.
H. R. 2111. Rose E. Harshey.
H. R. 2115. Ella Adelbert Campbell.
H. R. 2116. Ella Piper.
H. R. 2117. Esther E. Treat.
H. R. 2131. Elizabeth H. McGaughey.
H. R. 2133. Sophia P. Harris.
H. R. 2137. Margaret E. Harris.
H. R. 2144. Rosana Henson.
H. R. 2145. Emily A. Northcutt.
H. R. 2149. Jane Akens.
H. R. 2165. Jennie S. McKinsey.
H. R. 2201. Caroline R. Cole.
H. R. 2202. Laura Conner.
H. R. 2237. Julia DeL. Jackson.
H. R. 2245. Lydia A. Kean.
H. R. 2251. Amanda B. Koontz.
H. R. 2277. Ida M. Montgomery.
H. R. 2279. Nannie H. Moore.
H. R. 2295. Bessie S. Rogers.
H. R. 2329. Ola Tower.
H. R. 2332. Margaret J. Newlin.
H. R. 2333. Hannah K. Ramsey.
H. R. 2337. James C. Long.
H. R. 2338. Lou Shoemaker.
H. R. 2342. John P. Buck.
H. R. 2353. Emma Blackmer.
H. R. 2355. Rebecca Tackett.
H. R. 2356. Bridget Kelly.
H. R. 2417. F. Mary Berkley.
H. R. 2419. Martha P. Leinbach.
H. R. 2429. Elizabeth A. Bush.
H. R. 2430. Catherine O' Riley.
H. R. 2435. Mary E. Lamb.
H. R. 2442. Florence Dorser.
H. R. 2448. Marie Teresa Arnold.
H. R. 2451. Ona Foster.
H. R. 2452. Deiliah Elsaman.
H. R. 2453. Amanda Dirrim.
H. R. 2457. Susan Byrum.
H. R. 2459. Addie B. Arver.
H. R. 2460. Etta Burdsall.
H. R. 2461. Elizabeth C. Hess.
H. R. 2462. Clara Bell Wells.
H. R. 2467. Christine Schmale.
H. R. 2472. Philomena Rhody.
H. R. 2473. Susanna Becker.
H. R. 2474. Eliza C. Fraley.
H. R. 2475. Cordelia Snively.
H. R. 2476. Geraldine Wheatley.
H. R. 2477. Jennie Hitchcock.
H. R. 2479. Catherine Hannah.
H. R. 2480. Elizabeth Schaper.
H. R. 2482. Mary A. Hodge.
H. R. 2484. George W. Phillips.
H. R. 2485. Nancy Ellen Thomas.
H. R. 2486. Martha A. Willis.
H. R. 2487. Mary E. Kitchell.
H. R. 2489. John M. Leslie (or Lessley).
H. R. 2490. John R. Westfall, alias J. R. Westfall.
H. R. 2494. Rachel McIntosh.
H. R. 2495. Lucy Middleton.
H. R. 2496. Annie E. Mynard.
H. R. 2497. Sarah Patterson.
H. R. 2498. Florence A. Prince.
H. R. 2499. Jennie Rust.
H. R. 2500. Alice Simons.
H. R. 2503. Sarah J. Sprague.
H. R. 2506. Mary H. DeWaine.
H. R. 2508. Adalida Austin.
H. R. 2510. Mary A. McCartney.
H. R. 2511. Isabella D. Carder.
H. R. 2512. Maggie C. Bloom.
H. R. 2513. Anah R. Klugh.
H. R. 2533. Amanda Thompson.
H. R. 2535. Anna E. Bible.
H. R. 2536. Phoebe E. George.
H. R. 2537. Morgan Propst.
H. R. 2538. Abraham Keplinger.
H. R. 2539. Sarah Mallow.
H. R. 2540. Camila D. Purinton.
H. R. 2541. Emma E. Jackson.
H. R. 2542. Margaret Kitsmiller.
H. R. 2544. John D. Yokum, alias John D. Yoakum.
H. R. 2545. Mary A. Fike.
H. R. 2549. Jane Ferris.
H. R. 2552. Elzira Vanhoy.
H. R. 2558. Martha S. Lowe.
H. R. 2560. Mary E. Medley.
H. R. 2578. Etta Jane Hannan.
H. R. 2585. Nettie Moore.
H. R. 2586. Isabelle Woodworth.
H. R. 2595. Elizabeth Hill.
H. R. 2597. Georgia Haish.
H. R. 2598. Catharine O'Grady.
H. R. 2599. Elizabeth Seaburg.
H. R. 2600. Martha E. Seitz.
H. R. 2601. Mary A. White.
H. R. 2617. Malissa A. Pitts.
H. R. 2618. Belle Sparks.
H. R. 2621. Martin A. Hicks.
H. R. 2622. Elizabeth McComas.
H. R. 2624. Martha E. Lancaster.
H. R. 2634. Rhoda E. Harned.
H. R. 2635. Bettie R. Ruston.
H. R. 2636. Elizabeth Burns.
H. R. 2638. Maggie J. Brayfield.
H. R. 2639. Matilda C. Cole.
H. R. 2640. Nancy C. Reed.
H. R. 2641. Josephine Wise.
H. R. 2643. Martha Bennett.
H. R. 2648. Anna Neff.
H. R. 2649. Amanda E. Melton.
H. R. 2650. Caroline Olive High.
H. R. 2652. Irene P. Mentzer.
H. R. 2655. Ella A. Claypoole.
H. R. 2656. Maria G. Kelley.
H. R. 2657. Mary F. Bancroft.
H. R. 2658. Laura Buxton.
H. R. 2665. Annie Duncan.
H. R. 2666. Leah Lowrie.
H. R. 2701. Elizabeth Baldwin.
H. R. 2702. Emma Deetz.
H. R. 2703. Anna Cox.
H. R. 2704. Rebecca Ann Leas.
H. R. 2705. Sarilda C. Lake.
H. R. 2717. Mary Anderson.
H. R. 2722. Elizabeth R. McConnell.
H. R. 2723. Mary Slosser.
H. R. 2725. Ellen M. Carey.
H. R. 2726. Eliza J. Wilson.
H. R. 2738. Mary C. House.
H. R. 2739. Lizzie White.
H. R. 2764. Elizabeth Contz.
H. R. 2765. Elizabeth Copenhaver.
H. R. 2770. Susan Bales.
H. R. 2771. Anna M. Buell.
H. R. 2785. Carrie Harris.
H. R. 2787. Susan Cook.
H. R. 2788. Josephine Moore.
H. R. 2798. Mary P. L. Schrader.
H. R. 2804. Sarah Ann Jones.
H. R. 2813. Diana Patterson.
H. R. 2815. Julia McChesney.
H. R. 2816. Mary Granger.
H. R. 2823. Mary E. Rebsamen.
H. R. 2832. Emilia Gulantz.
H. R. 2841. Hannah W. Davenport.
H. R. 2845. Effie Davis.
H. R. 2847. Margaret Frizzell.
H. R. 2851. Harriett J. Behanna.
H. R. 2852. Estelle Eby.
H. R. 2853. Mary J. Brown.
H. R. 2861. Sarah A. Fortney.
H. R. 2870. Nora Boyer.
H. R. 2871. Jasper Martin.
H. R. 2872. Albert E. Shaw, alias Albert Shaw, alias A. E. Shaw.
H. R. 2874. Mary Conaway.
H. R. 2877. Laura Frankfather.
H. R. 2886. Frank Farmer, alias Frank Farmer.
H. R. 2892. Mary L. Lewis.
H. R. 2905. Cora Spencer.
H. R. 2907. Laura Mitchell.
H. R. 2908. Mary Vicks.
H. R. 2909. Jessie Hoyt.
H. R. 2910. Florence Robbins.
H. R. 2911. Mary Matthias.
H. R. 2912. Jennie Cousins.
H. R. 2913. Christian Gansert, alias Christian Ganshirt, alias Christian Gausert, alias Christian Gunshirt.
H. R. 2915. Hannah Mosher.
H. R. 2919. Sarah E. Thomas.
H. R. 2920. Orleans Wildman.
H. R. 2921. Albert Ware.
H. R. 2927. Emma Phillips.
H. R. 2928. Olive Marvel.
H. R. 2929. Nora M. Woodson.
H. R. 2930. Sarah J. Dye.
H. R. 2935. Nellie Crawford.
H. R. 2948. Missouri J. Ackley.
H. R. 2953. Nancy Shepherd.
H. R. 2957. Agnes A. Boyles.
H. R. 2972. Jane Mick.
H. R. 2985. Eva Davison.
H. R. 2988. Mary B. Greene.
H. R. 2989. Matt Hogan.
H. R. 2992. Amanda White.
H. R. 2994. Charlotte Buck.
H. R. 3001. Arthur McDaniel.
H. R. 3002. William Campbell.
H. R. 3008. Carrie York.
H. R. 3009. Alfred Streeter.
H. R. 3012. Amanda E. Roy.
H. R. 3015. Samantha E. Hunter.
H. R. 3019. Mary Dyer.
H. R. 3021. Amanda Bland.
H. R. 3026. Marie Fell.
H. R. 3029. Martha A. Terwilliger.
H. R. 3031. Clara Daved.
H. R. 3032. Susie P. Van Nostrand.
H. R. 3033. Ida Van Loan McWhood.
H. R. 3034. Julia Finley.
H. R. 3052. Mary E. Howard.
H. R. 3053. Martha A. Howe.
H. R. 3054. Julia E. Chase.
H. R. 3056. Eunice G. Trombly.
H. R. 3058. Lavina Corwin.
H. R. 3062. Isaac Holt.
H. R. 3063. George W. Madden, alias G. W. Madden.
H. R. 3064. Nancy E. Gallamore.
H. R. 3065. Lavina Jackson.
H. R. 3066. Linea E. McCamon.
H. R. 3067. Mary M. Nelson.
H. R. 3068. Jennie Lee.
H. R. 3069. Elizabeth A. Woodland.
H. R. 3070. Mary A. Shankland.
H. R. 3071. Margaret J. Vandyke.
H. R. 3074. Calista Ealy.
H. R. 3076. Louisa B. Noble.
H. R. 3080. Isabella Randall.
H. R. 3081. Lucretia Brubaker.

- H. R. 3082. Lizzie M. Henry.
H. R. 3095. Sarah R. Naylor.
H. R. 3096. Catherine E. Bankerd.
H. R. 3113. Anna J. Jaycox.
H. R. 3114. Mollie E. Ramsdell.
H. R. 3115. Elmira Rice.
H. R. 3128. Nancy A. Smalley.
H. R. 3130. Mary A. Andrews.
H. R. 3132. Nellie M. Corbin.
H. R. 3135. Joe Duckett.
H. R. 3151. Mary A. Dwinells.
H. R. 3152. Lena C. Finney.
H. R. 3153. Susanna Guyer.
H. R. 3154. Mary D. Montgomery.
H. R. 3156. Betsy Van Amburg.
H. R. 3157. Emily M. Emmons.
H. R. 3158. Margaret Buckley Paine.
H. R. 3161. Nancy E. Sprung.
H. R. 3171. Marie A. Thurston.
H. R. 3172. Emily Irish.
H. R. 3173. Emily R. Sherman.
H. R. 3181. Matilda Fisher.
H. R. 3182. Corena J. Wilson.
H. R. 3185. Addie C. Foster.
H. R. 3189. Nettie J. Aldrich.
H. R. 3190. Eliza F. Withee.
H. R. 3196. Kate Shideler.
H. R. 3197. Nettie Elliott.
H. R. 3199. Rachel A. Colesworthy.
H. R. 3202. Martha A. Howard.
H. R. 3220. Mary E. Dickinson.
H. R. 3221. Millie B. Sherwood.
H. R. 3223. Chesley D. Wallace.
H. R. 3235. Mary Anna Butler.
H. R. 3237. Mary H. Criss.
H. R. 3248. Edith J. Helmick.
H. R. 3286. Ella R. Crall.
H. R. 3298. Pencela Shaw.
H. R. 3300. Anna Katherine Pierce.
H. R. 3301. Margaret C. Hotchkiss.
H. R. 3304. Martha A. Minton.
H. R. 3307. Martha J. McLaughlin.
H. R. 3326. Jane M. Houghton.
H. R. 3335. Lucy E. Gettig.
H. R. 3339. Kate Huston.
H. R. 3340. Mary Renner.
H. R. 3341. Florence A. Hamlin.
H. R. 3342. Hortense J. Gott.
H. R. 3343. Mary J. Whitney.
H. R. 3344. Margaret McGrath.
H. R. 3345. Sara Ann Riley.
H. R. 3348. Mary E. Beckner.
H. R. 3349. Clara V. Gilmore.
H. R. 3350. Emma Isabel Wank.
H. R. 3351. Myrtle Rockwell.
H. R. 3375. Idella F. Lemmons.
H. R. 3376. Naomi S. Summers.
H. R. 3377. Ephraim Malcolm, alias Ephraim Malcom.
H. R. 3407. Rhoda A. Paine.
H. R. 3411. Mary E. Marx.
H. R. 3413. Mary C. Wilday.
H. R. 3414. Cynthia Stiles.
H. R. 3415. Catherine Van Debo-gart.
H. R. 3416. Eliza Dickerson.
H. R. 3420. Rebecca Sperry.
H. R. 3421. Sarah Jane Cook.
H. R. 3425. Sarah A. Ressler.
H. R. 3427. Alice R. Decker.
H. R. 3437. Cynthia Spicknall.
H. R. 3454. Emma Dell Franklin.
H. R. 3460. Nora Hicks.
H. R. 3463. Anna Davidson.
H. R. 3465. Zue McLaughlin.
H. R. 3466. George A. Credit.
H. R. 3467. Grover C. Pollard.
H. R. 3468. Sarah F. Snelling.
H. R. 3470. Rebecca Flack.
H. R. 3471. Lovina Steelman.
H. R. 3472. Rebecca E. Dwyer.
H. R. 3482. Fannie P. Stutsman.
H. R. 3484. Nannie E. Lindy.
H. R. 3485. Emma J. Fouts.
H. R. 3487. Sarah E. Swick.
H. R. 3489. Florence Jones.
H. R. 3502. Maude Lingenfelter.
H. R. 3504. Priscilla Pye.
H. R. 3505. Sarah L. Seltzer.
H. R. 3510. Adella Green.
H. R. 3513. Amelia Jones.
H. R. 3515. Mary A. Ueberroth.
H. R. 3516. Sarah E. Reinert.
H. R. 3517. Amelia Henry.
H. R. 3518. Mary A. Shoemaker.
H. R. 3519. Emma Smith.
H. R. 3523. Amanda E. Welch.
H. R. 3528. Sarah J. Stewart.
H. R. 3530. Rebecca M. Luttrell.
H. R. 3531. Ellen Kivlin.
H. R. 3532. Maria E. Smith.
H. R. 3534. Winnie Graham.
H. R. 3535. Mary J. Bradfield.
H. R. 3540. Ellen A. Delp.
H. R. 3542. Nellie A. Farrell.
H. R. 3554. Lillie Albert.
H. R. 3558. Emma James.
H. R. 3560. Fannie Kendrick.
H. R. 3561. Lemuel Simpson.
H. R. 3562. Sally Farman.
H. R. 3577. Rachel Fleming.
H. R. 3582. Thirza C. Spencer.
H. R. 3615. Ellen Martin.
H. R. 3616. Jennie W. Perkins.
H. R. 3619. Jennie Snook.
H. R. 3621. Addie Bryan.
H. R. 3623. Samantha Midgett.
H. R. 3626. Martha E. Harlan.
H. R. 3627. Anna E. Hedges.
H. R. 3628. Sarah E. Sidebottom.
H. R. 3630. Louisa J. Kennedy.
H. R. 3632. Marilla Shipley.
H. R. 3640. Fannie C. Hawkins.
H. R. 3641. Mary Helena Dahn.
H. R. 3642. Nancy Melton.
H. R. 3646. Martha E. Tilman.
H. R. 3647. John Garrison.
H. R. 3651. Francis M. Snider.
H. R. 3652. Martha A. Davis.
H. R. 3654. Florence K. Rowland.
H. R. 3667. Mary E. Jackson.
H. R. 3668. Augusta L. W. Dahn-bart.
H. R. 3670. Mary L. Porter.
H. R. 3673. Anna M. Miller.
H. R. 3675. Manerva E. Osborn.
H. R. 3683. Mary J. Wells.
H. R. 3684. Alberta Lutzman.
H. R. 3686. Mary Wallace.
H. R. 3700. Isabella M. Playford.
H. R. 3701. Lena Kemmis.
H. R. 3715. Alice M. McCoy.
H. R. 3725. Antoinette Boiyard.
H. R. 3733. Sarah A. Hattman.
H. R. 3740. Jacob W. Wyman.
H. R. 3741. Alice Elliott.
H. R. 3742. Catharine McLaughlin.
H. R. 3743. Maude A. Sarbaugh.
H. R. 3744. Elizabeth Francis.
H. R. 3745. Hester Benjamin.
H. R. 3751. Mary E. Racener.
H. R. 3763. Mary Jane Pennington.
H. R. 3773. Lavina Benson.
H. R. 3774. Susan E. Johnson.
H. R. 3775. Isaac N. Cook.
H. R. 3777. Eliza Musser.
H. R. 3779. Lida Loten.
H. R. 3794. Emma E. Frazier.
H. R. 3796. Ann Hazelton.
H. R. 3797. Angeline Robison.
H. R. 3804. Elizabeth Mellott.
H. R. 3805. Laura H. Stearns.
H. R. 3808. Louisa Benson.
H. R. 3813. Elizabeth C. Whiteman.
H. R. 3817. Sarah E. McKevitt.
H. R. 3819. Lou Smith.
H. R. 3836. Clorinda Smith.
H. R. 3843. Emma Gray.
H. R. 3847. Roxie Fellows.
H. R. 3849. Esther Wilson.
H. R. 3850. Martha E. Walston.
H. R. 3852. Nancy A. Lynn.
H. R. 3854. Elizabeth Stark.
H. R. 3855. Lydia M. Walton.
H. R. 3856. Anna C. Curtis.
H. R. 3857. Winifred Whitney.
H. R. 3858. Evelyn L. Varnham.
H. R. 3861. Mary J. Turner.
H. R. 3880. Emma E. Roulston.
H. R. 3882. Anna Bragdon.
H. R. 3883. Alice A. Eggleston.
H. R. 3884. Nellie M. Lewis.
H. R. 3885. Mary J. Perry.
H. R. 3886. Harriett S. Blair.
H. R. 3887. Iola A. McBride.
H. R. 3894. Maude Oatman.
H. R. 3897. Hannah Kissinger.
H. R. 3899. Amelia Bauman.
H. R. 3900. Rose Faust.
H. R. 3901. Ruth McConnell.
H. R. 3904. Sophy Nash.
H. R. 3905. Ellen C. Hozan.
H. R. 3907. Rebecca C. Walker.
H. R. 3909. Anna H. E. Hale.
H. R. 3918. Ruth A. Stanley.
H. R. 3919. Mary A. Burbank.
H. R. 3931. America V. Gordon.
H. R. 3936. Anna M. Thompson.
H. R. 3946. Sarah E. Kauffman.
H. R. 3947. Sarah A. Ackerman.
H. R. 3953. Ellie C. Raugh.
H. R. 3954. Maria Burkhardt.
H. R. 3958. Martin Copeland.
H. R. 3961. Flora A. Smith.
H. R. 3962. Martha Groves.
H. R. 3963. Catharine S. James.
H. R. 3964. Elizabeth Snively.
H. R. 3981. Lila M. Studley.
H. R. 3982. Mary J. Phillips.
H. R. 3983. Debbie E. Casey.
H. R. 3986. Fannie Neff.
H. R. 3988. Julia Duncan.
H. R. 3989. Effie R. Brooks.
H. R. 3991. Laura M. Cooper.
H. R. 3993. Mary Walden.
H. R. 3994. Elizabeth Teel.
H. R. 3998. Sarah L. Meador.
H. R. 3999. Louisa M. Cochran.
H. R. 4003. Dora Hupp.
H. R. 4005. Mitylene Gunn.
H. R. 4012. Celia Foot.
H. R. 4027. Melissa L. Carroll.
H. R. 4028. Kate Davis.
H. R. 4032. Daniel M. Dice.
H. R. 4035. Jane Mallow.
H. R. 4041. Julia A. Collett.
H. R. 4043. Thomas M. Johnson.
H. R. 4045. Mary C. Hopper.
H. R. 4046. Elizabeth Miller.
H. R. 4047. America B. Halcomb.
H. R. 4049. Elizabeth Edwards.
H. R. 4051. Henrietta B. Sheffield.
H. R. 4057. Minerva Henderson.
H. R. 4058. Mary A. Fowler.
H. R. 4059. Keturah H. Grismer.
H. R. 4077. William C. Mason.
H. R. 4078. Mary Evaline Keith.
H. R. 4092. Rhajene Riley.
H. R. 4093. Emily A. Broce.
H. R. 4094. Margaret Kitts.
H. R. 4095. Nancy J. Martindale.
H. R. 4096. Louise A. Hubbard.
H. R. 4113. Susannah Finkle.
H. R. 4119. Mary M. Polling.
H. R. 4120. Maria Hayes.
H. R. 4160. Susana Reiter.
H. R. 4162. Margaret C. Vertz.
H. R. 4179. Elizabeth Carnicom.
H. R. 4209. Mary Currier.
H. R. 4211. Samantha Walton.
H. R. 4213. Armlida Boughn.
H. R. 4214. Mary P. Backenstoe.
H. R. 4216. Damaris Hidy.
H. R. 4219. Amanda Doster.
H. R. 4220. V. Caroline Irwin.
H. R. 4222. Jennie L. Organ.
H. R. 4223. Emily Stuckey.
H. R. 4226. Susan Powell.
H. R. 4230. Sarah J. Turner.
H. R. 4236. Lena Van Dusen.
H. R. 4239. Mary E. Van Brunt.
H. R. 4240. Isabella Soden.
H. R. 4244. Fannie Duncan.
H. R. 4248. Eleanor Getsinger.
H. R. 4249. Martha L. Barcus.
H. R. 4250. Eliza J. Roberts.
H. R. 4258. Wilhelmina Grignon.
H. R. 4262. Martha Holder.
H. R. 4263. Robert Nance.
H. R. 4264. Jesse B. Chyle, alias Bea Chyle.
H. R. 4265. George Terry.
H. R. 4266. Helen A. George.
H. R. 4267. Emily E. Briggs.
H. R. 4270. Amanda Minsel.
H. R. 4271. Serena A. Ody.
H. R. 4272. Jennie A. Wright.
H. R. 4273. Julia Dean.
H. R. 4274. Ellen Goodwin.
H. R. 4275. Kate McGovern.
H. R. 4277. Alice Sorrells.
H. R. 4278. Louvania C. Railsback.
H. R. 4279. Ellen Smith.
H. R. 4283. Clarinda Culbertson.
H. R. 4284. E. Ellen V. Roberts.
H. R. 4294. Annie McMillan.
H. R. 4295. Gerena Killinger.
H. R. 4296. Martha Patterson.
H. R. 4297. Lucy Baker.
H. R. 4298. Margaret Probasco.
H. R. 4300. Dora Smith.
H. R. 4304. Emmitt Mitchell.
H. R. 4306. Andrew Kesler.
H. R. 4308. Samuel N. Trout.
H. R. 4309. Sarah R. Linton.
H. R. 4312. Nancy Bennett.
H. R. 4315. Susan A. Darling.
H. R. 4317. Martha E. Finch.
H. R. 4318. Marcella Frances.
H. R. 4319. Eliza J. Grover.
H. R. 4320. Sarah A. Hayes.
H. R. 4321. Mary E. Hunter.
H. R. 4324. Ada C. Moore.
H. R. 4325. Sarah M. Murdick.
H. R. 4330. Belle Adams.
H. R. 4331. Eugene D. Campbell.
H. R. 4332. Laura A. Shipley.
H. R. 4333. Lyde Maklem.
H. R. 4334. Eliza M. Elliott.
H. R. 4335. Mary Almada McNeil.
H. R. 4336. Laura Spresser.
H. R. 4337. Louisa Miller.
H. R. 4338. Emma McClean.
H. R. 4339. Elizabeth N. Clark.
H. R. 4340. Ella N. Herwick.
H. R. 4343. Caroline Meier.
H. R. 4344. Catherine Ambs.
H. R. 4348. Margaret A. Scott.
H. R. 4354. Harriet Spriggs.
H. R. 4358. Eliza J. Walker.
H. R. 4361. Mary J. Cummings.
H. R. 4362. Josephine Williams.
H. R. 4364. Lizzie Rettich.
H. R. 4365. Persis Cook.
H. R. 4367. Emma Hunter.
H. R. 4368. Elizabeth F. Maberry.
H. R. 4369. Martha Crump.
H. R. 4371. Mary J. Bailey.
H. R. 4372. Julia F. Holloway.
H. R. 4374. Alice Munson.
H. R. 4375. Mary E. Hoisington.
H. R. 4378. Mary Ann Hobbs.
H. R. 4379. Sarah E. Bennett.
H. R. 4382. Caroline E. Devore.
H. R. 4384. Malinda J. Turner.
H. R. 4387. Almira Ketcham.
H. R. 4391. Nancy C. Pile.
H. R. 4392. Lena Veal.
H. R. 4393. Martha J. Williams.
H. R. 4395. Ella Harlan.
H. R. 4396. Isabella M. Hair.
H. R. 4402. John Bohon, alias John Bohon, jr.
H. R. 4403. Mary E. Everman.
H. R. 4404. Nancy A. Chrisman.
H. R. 4407. Elizabeth Hefner.
H. R. 4408. Marilla A. Parrott.
H. R. 4413. Caroline M. Amidon.
H. R. 4414. Viola M. Chapin.
H. R. 4416. Isabelle Fletcher.
H. R. 4417. Belinda Finch.
H. R. 4418. Agnes J. Steinbarga.
H. R. 4421. Celia M. Pike.
H. R. 4422. Electa Lawrence.
H. R. 4427. Mary A. Cotterell.
H. R. 4428. Mary B. Price.
H. R. 4429. Elizabeth A. Ross.
H. R. 4432. Henrietta Collins.
H. R. 4433. Irene A. Case.
H. R. 4434. Martha E. Radcliff.
H. R. 4436. Amanda E. Tumbleson.
H. R. 4437. Frances E. Brown.
H. R. 4445. Virginia Roy.
H. R. 4446. Elizabeth Smith.
H. R. 4448. Leoline R. Coogle.
H. R. 4449. Hannah R. Hedrick.
H. R. 4450. Job Davis, alias Jobe Davis.
H. R. 4451. Kesiah Trembly.
H. R. 4452. Cyrena Trahern.
H. R. 4453. Rhoda Benson.
H. R. 4455. Mary J. Hovatter.
H. R. 4457. Washington Roy.
H. R. 4461. Lettie E. Deyo.
H. R. 4467. Maggie Meyer.
H. R. 4470. S. Belle Leader.
H. R. 4471. Ella E. Murray.
H. R. 4472. Agnes G. Overholt.
H. R. 4473. Nellie Julia Ellen Snyder.
H. R. 4474. Ella M. Butterfield.
H. R. 4475. Henrietta McNutt.
H. R. 4476. Sallie R. Bryant.
H. R. 4477. Lucinda J. Ray.
H. R. 4478. Sarah A. Baynes.
H. R. 4479. Martha E. Goodwin and her dependent daughter Edna E. Goodwin.
H. R. 4480. Sarah E. Elliott and her dependent son Earl Elliott.
H. R. 4481. Anderson T. Redding.
H. R. 4483. Ellen S. Epperson.
H. R. 4484. Birdie Alice Townsley.
H. R. 4485. Mary E. Small.
H. R. 4486. Lucinda Hall.
H. R. 4487. Eliza Jacob.
H. R. 4488. Maria Berry.
H. R. 4489. Emily F. Wall.
H. R. 4491. Mena Ehrlich.
H. R. 4492. Carrie McCoy.
H. R. 4493. Hester A. John.
H. R. 4495. Malinda J. Strayline.
H. R. 4498. Mary A. Shepherd.
H. R. 4503. Ann E. Anderson.
H. R. 4504. Sarah C. Miller.
H. R. 4505. Susan E. Watts.
H. R. 4506. Nancy E. Urquhart.
H. R. 4510. Mary A. Downes.
H. R. 4512. Martha Dickson.
H. R. 4514. Annie M. Hilliker.
H. R. 4518. Elie Brewer.
H. R. 4519. Deborah A. Smith.
H. R. 4521. Mary F. Mills.
H. R. 4522. Rebecca A. Sohn.
H. R. 4523. Newton Corbin.
H. R. 4526. Martha A. Foreman.
H. R. 4527. Nancy A. Hall.
H. R. 4534. Harriet E. Sprague.
H. R. 4535. Ellen M. Chace.
H. R. 4544. Julia M. Armstrong.
H. R. 4546. Eliza Frances White.
H. R. 4547. Frances M. Woodruff.
H. R. 4549. Letitia Comstock.
H. R. 4550. Sarah E. Leahy.
H. R. 4555. John Q. Sapp.
H. R. 4556. Desdemonia Lansdown.
H. R. 4557. Eliza J. Rasco.
H. R. 4561. Katherine Folsche.
H. R. 4562. Frances S. Hicks.
H. R. 4567. Mary E. Baldwin.
H. R. 4568. Clarissa Pillars.
H. R. 4571. Mary E. Pool.
H. R. 4579. Jeannett Fortney.
H. R. 4580. Ella P. Long.
H. R. 4581. Sarah J. Courtney.
H. R. 4582. Margaret Nolan.
H. R. 4583. Virginia Riley.
H. R. 4584. Edson G. Hine.
H. R. 4594. Thomas F. Conrad, alias T. F. Conrad.
H. R. 4600. Florence A. Warrington.
H. R. 4601. Maria Loy.
H. R. 4602. Mamie Lewis.
H. R. 4608. George W. Dodson, alias George M. Dodson.
H. R. 4610. Nancy L. Little.
H. R. 4611. Harriet A. Clawson.
H. R. 4613. Austin Mondon.
H. R. 4616. Amanda E. Tate.
H. R. 4620. Elvira Poston.
H. R. 4621. Nancy J. Johnson.
H. R. 4623. Nora Amanda Combs.
H. R. 4624. Phena Knaggs.
H. R. 4626. Anna R. Miller.
H. R. 4627. Hattie L. Maley.

H. R. 4628. Louisa A. Ballinger.
 H. R. 4629. Mitchell Day.
 H. R. 4635. Mary E. Ridenour.
 H. R. 4639. Wilhelmine Ulrich.
 H. R. 4641. David Edgar Ellis.
 H. R. 4644. Mary A. Barnes.
 H. R. 4646. Pleas Godall, alias Pleasant Godall.
 H. R. 4652. Montra Sanders.
 H. R. 4653. Martha E. Gaines.
 H. R. 4663. Caroline E. Friend.
 H. R. 4665. Rosina M. Armbruster.
 H. R. 4667. Elizabeth Tasker.
 H. R. 4668. Mary V. McDonald.
 H. R. 4670. Eliza A. Grant.
 H. R. 4671. Mary L. Ogborn.
 H. R. 4672. George W. Hillard.
 H. R. 4678. Eliza Vance.
 H. R. 4680. Mary J. Clare.
 H. R. 4685. Jane A. Brill.
 H. R. 4686. Hattie McGonagal.
 H. R. 4692. Mary J. Waddill.
 H. R. 4693. Hannah Holly.
 H. R. 4694. Sarah E. Vining.
 H. R. 4701. Mary E. McMeen.
 H. R. 4702. Harriett L. Allinson.
 H. R. 4703. Susan E. Wootters.
 H. R. 4705. Jennie E. Hayes.
 H. R. 4708. Marian W. Hubbard.
 H. R. 4712. Elizabeth Mathews.
 H. R. 4713. Barbara A. Adams.
 H. R. 4714. Rachel J. Shoemaker.
 H. R. 4715. Harriet J. Yost.
 H. R. 4716. Mina B. York.
 H. R. 4717. Emma Snyder.
 H. R. 4719. Fannie Brown.
 H. R. 4720. Mary E. Chess.
 H. R. 4726. Ella Logan Bullett.
 H. R. 4728. Naomi A. Ellis.
 H. R. 4729. Julia C. Drake.
 H. R. 4730. Celia Anderson.
 H. R. 4736. Laura E. Housel.
 H. R. 4737. Elbert Daniels.
 H. R. 4740. Annette Frerking.
 H. R. 4741. Issac M. Crow, alias Isaac Crow.
 H. R. 4742. Lucretia Gibson.
 H. R. 4744. Hannah S. Evans.
 H. R. 4745. Harriet T. Fry.
 H. R. 4746. Sarah E. Cubbison.
 H. R. 4747. Drusilla Hanna McIntyre.
 H. R. 4748. Jane Cox.
 H. R. 4750. Edith Patton.
 H. R. 4751. Matilda Beighley.
 H. R. 4752. Frances A. Book.
 H. R. 4753. Elizabeth Chatham.
 H. R. 4754. Nancy Gibson.
 H. R. 4755. Margret Winkler.
 H. R. 4756. Susan Wilson McCracken.
 H. R. 4757. Nancy E. Palmer.
 H. R. 4758. Elizabeth Wymer.
 H. R. 4759. Priscilla Wise.
 H. R. 4761. Catherine Sells.
 H. R. 4780. Harriet E. Townsend.
 H. R. 4782. Mary E. Sly.
 H. R. 4785. Jessie T. Gray.
 H. R. 4786. Thresa Mishler.
 H. R. 4787. Belinda Bender.
 H. R. 4788. Jennie Ditch.
 H. R. 4789. Hettie Bell.
 H. R. 4790. Lorena F. DeArmand.
 H. R. 4792. Maria J. Morrison.
 H. R. 4794. William H. Masterson.
 H. R. 4795. Esther Elizabeth Atteberry.
 H. R. 4796. Mary M. Brady.
 H. R. 4802. Minnie V. Cobbs.
 H. R. 4803. Mary Parris.
 H. R. 4804. Eliza A. Goodell.
 H. R. 4807. Mary F. Perrin.
 H. R. 4817. Carrie L. Ockington.
 H. R. 4818. Sarah A. McElroy.
 H. R. 4819. Sarah E. Wolf.
 H. R. 4820. Sarah A. Miller.
 H. R. 4821. Susie B. Weeden.
 H. R. 4822. Mary E. Cook.
 H. R. 4824. Dianah Arnett.
 H. R. 4826. Ulyssus Garrett Sheets.
 H. R. 4839. John A. Pate.
 H. R. 4842. Abbie E. Gibbs.
 H. R. 4844. Rose Dufore.
 H. R. 4845. Cynthia A. Dwiggins.
 H. R. 4860. Sarah Lyons.
 H. R. 4863. Alice Finch.
 H. R. 4864. Phoebe Putman.
 H. R. 4865. Addie M. Tower.
 H. R. 4866. Margaret E. Fletcher.
 H. R. 4868. Clara E. Wade.
 H. R. 4872. E. M. Austin.
 H. R. 4885. Julia Squires.
 H. R. 4891. Samantha Vose.
 H. R. 4895. Anna Kelley.
 H. R. 4901. Bessie Roosa.
 H. R. 4902. Adelaide V. Hutchinson.
 H. R. 4903. Nellie Gorsuch.
 H. R. 4904. Gertrude A. Schafer.
 H. R. 4912. Marian Bayless.
 H. R. 4913. Martha J. Davis.
 H. R. 4916. Pearl L. Clark.
 H. R. 4917. Hannah M. Cratty.
 H. R. 4919. Annie M. Gamble.
 H. R. 4920. Anna W. Udell.
 H. R. 4925. Carrie Russel Brown.
 H. R. 4960. Clara M. Dronebarger.
 H. R. 4963. Loretta W. Frye.
 H. R. 4964. Barbara A. Dill.
 H. R. 4965. Ellen Snyder.
 H. R. 4967. Martha Strong.
 H. R. 4968. Mary E. Sharpe.
 H. R. 4977. Emily J. McGee.
 H. R. 4985. Kattie Miller.
 H. R. 4991. Joanna H. Phillips.
 H. R. 4999. Elizabeth Jones.
 H. R. 5010. Margaret Thompson.
 H. R. 5012. Mary J. Turner.
 H. R. 5021. Callie R. Graf.
 H. R. 5022. Emma E. Kerr.
 H. R. 5023. Hannah Piper.
 H. R. 5024. George A. Forsyth.
 H. R. 5025. Katy Douse.
 H. R. 5027. Martha E. Ramsey.
 H. R. 5029. Rosa Brown Miller.
 H. R. 5030. Sarah A. Welsh.
 H. R. 5034. Louisa M. Gay.
 H. R. 5036. Jessie Ganung.
 H. R. 5037. Edna M. Breese.
 H. R. 5041. Elbina I. Pool.
 H. R. 5067. Elizabeth Kesner.
 H. R. 5068. Elizabeth Ait.
 H. R. 5072. Isabell Roseberry.
 H. R. 5089. Maria Lobnow.
 H. R. 5120. Mary A. Bates.
 H. R. 5121. Elizabeth Abeel.
 H. R. 5128. Elizabeth Bowman.
 H. R. 5132. Fannie G. Smith.
 H. R. 5136. Rebecca L. Thrasher.
 H. R. 5137. Mary Alice Eastman.
 H. R. 5139. Rachel Kusske.
 H. R. 5146. Martha Hudson.
 H. R. 5148. Susan Vroman.
 H. R. 5150. John Ozenberger.
 H. R. 5167. Mary E. Smith.
 H. R. 5246. Sarah E. Ewing.
 H. R. 5255. Mary E. Murphy.
 H. R. 5301. Elmira E. Chapman.
 H. R. 5319. Susie H. Wright.
 H. R. 5381. Eliza Darrab.
 H. R. 5387. Mary E. Blaney.
 H. R. 5388. Mary McCann.
 H. R. 5468. Julia A. Cammeron.
 H. R. 5474. Ellen R. McKnight.
 H. R. 5481. Mary Mund.
 H. R. 5722. Mary E. Crow.
 H. R. 5851. Mary F. Plummer.
 H. R. 5874. Cynthia A. Emmons.
 H. R. 5967. Emma Pierce.
 H. R. 5989. Amelia Stoops.
 H. R. 5992. Sarah J. Hamlin.
 H. R. 6006. Polly Melton.
 H. R. 6279. Mary Jane Woofter.
 H. R. 6283. Elizabeth Cachelin.
 H. R. 6497. Gertrude A. Haught.
 H. R. 6498. Matilda A. Jones.
 H. R. 6684. Ezekiel Couch.
 H. R. 6759. Hulda E. Anderson.
 H. R. 7468. Mary C. Kincaid.

PROHIBITION OR CHRISTIANITY

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] for one hour.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the recent hysterical outburst of the four horsemen of the prohibition forces indicates the demoralization in their ranks and that they have reached a realization of the failure of the sumptuary prohibition laws.

May the day never come when the Federal officials enforcing prohibition will look to Idaho for guidance! The recent wholesale indictments and convictions of Idaho officials for conspiracy to violate the prohibition laws are fresh in the minds of the American people. Under Federal prohibition drunks and drunken vehicle drivers have increased by leaps and bounds even in the little city of Boise, Idaho. In 1919 there were 142 drunks arrested; in 1928 there were 262. In 1919 there were no drunken vehicle drivers arrested; in 1928 there were 32. In San Antonio, Tex., in 1928, there were 4,242 drunks arrested, no statistics for 1919 being available for comparison. The chief of police, Atlanta, Ga., in his annual report for 1928, stated that, "Drunkness and bootlegging cases are increasing by leaps and bounds."

I would suggest that the four horsemen of the prohibition forces turn their oratorical guns and attention to the States of Georgia, Idaho, Texas, and Nebraska, where a deplorable condition exists to-day as a result of prohibition.

In these States under Federal prohibition bootlegging, drunkenness, and drunken vehicle drivers have increased tremendously; fundamental rights guaranteed to our people under the Constitution flagrantly violated; lives snuffed out without due process of law by irresponsible and fanatical enforcement agents; the privacy of life and the sanctity of the home guaranteed under the Constitution ruthlessly violated.

The four horsemen apparently believe that the eighteenth amendment is the supreme law of the land and the only part of the Constitution to be considered in these days of prohibition. The sending of a citizen to jail for five years for sale, transporting, or possession of a bottle of beverage with alcoholic content of more than one-half of 1 per cent is their holy of the holiest. It makes no difference to them whether the said citizen is denied the rights and liberties guaranteed under the Constitution; no difference whether he is executed by fanatical enforcement agents without due process of law; and no difference whether the privacy of his home and effects is violated.

God forgive fanatical prohibition demagogues who have clothed themselves in the robes of righteousness, for they know not what they do!

The whines and wails of the dry leaders to-day are comparable to rats leaving a sinking ship.

Having seen that the unwholesome conditions in the country resulting from prohibition have weakened their case, they are now endeavoring to open up an avenue of escape from their untenable position by attacking those charged with enforcing the Federal prohibition laws.

In their mad hysteria the dries fail to realize that this attack proves a boomerang when they claim the present deplorable situation is, due to the result of Federal maladministration. What is the matter with their State enforcement agencies, including their municipal governments? Dry crusaders from States forever preaching State rights should be the last to alibi the present situation resulting from prohibition by an attack on Federal administration.

Statements appearing in the press the past week indicate that the dry crusaders realize the fact that information obtained by the crime commission would weaken the position of those favoring a continuation of the prohibition laws.

From a modification standpoint open hearings by the crime commission would be wholesome and enlightening. The people would have a better opportunity of obtaining additional first-hand statistics indicating the general lawlessness and disrespect for law existing throughout the country to-day as a result of the sumptuary dry laws.

Certain attacks on the crime commission are indefensible, such as the demand for the removal of one member who called attention to a phase of lawlessness violating sacred rights and liberties guaranteed to our people under the Constitution long before the eighteenth amendment was ever conceived.

In delivering a radio talk in the Nation's Capital on January 2 the new Moses of the prohibition movement stated:

I have been over the country a great deal during the last year and the number of drunks I have seen can be noted on my two hands.

I do not know what part of the country this dry leader has visited and to which he refers. He must have been traveling

The following amendments were severally reported and severally agreed to:

Page 56, line 18, after the first word "of," strike out the name "Cecilia" and insert in lieu thereof the name "Cecelia."

Page 100, strike out lines 12 to 15, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Julia Finley, having died.

Page 105, strike out lines 19 to 23, inclusive, the proposed beneficiary, Mary A. Dwinells, having died.

These amendments reduce the estimated cost of the bill \$360 per annum; the estimated annual cost of the bill as now reported is \$257,720.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

over the deserts and sagebrush lands of some of our Western States. The travels of this dry leader apparently did not take him to the city of Seattle, whose police statistics indicate 4,277 drunks arrested in 1919, prior to prohibition, and an increase under prohibition which culminated in 7,309 in the year 1928.

Mr. SPOUL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I can not yield now to my good friend. I must hurry on in order to finish my speech in the time allotted to me.

The population of Seattle, Wash., according to the 1920 Federal census, was 315,685, and the estimated population by the Census Bureau, as of July 1, 1928, was 383,200. His travels apparently did not take him to the city of Cleveland, the largest city in the State of Ohio—the State where the Anti-Saloon League was conceived, born, and reared, and in which its national headquarters is now located—whose police statistics indicate 5,121 drunks arrested in 1919, prior to prohibition, and an increase under prohibition which culminated in 32,925 in the year 1928, and 24,343 for the first nine months in 1929. The population of Cleveland, Ohio, according to the 1920 Federal census was 796,841, and the estimated population by the Census Bureau, as of July 1, 1928, was 1,010,300.

It can not be denied that prohibition has ushered in an age of corruption, intemperance, disrespect for law, and contempt for government such as this Nation never before witnessed. The Constitution has been changed from a charter of rights and liberties into a criminal statute book. How can people respect a Constitution that makes the act of temperance a crime?

The cause of temperance can never be advanced by intemperate legislation. The failure of prohibition is inherent in its principle and not due to wrong or faulty methods of enforcement. So long as the American people refuse to recognize the act of drinking as evidence of moral guilt, prohibition will be a failure.

What is fundamentally wrong with our prohibition laws is the fact that they are in conflict with the laws of nature. There is no fruit containing sugar which does not also contain the fermentation spore. The juice of such fruits has within itself the media for oxidizing the sugar and thereby converting it into alcohol. Nature has placed a limit on the alcohol which can be produced in this way, limiting it to 14 per cent by causing the fermentation spore to vanish as soon as 14 per cent of alcohol has been produced in the fermented fruit juice. The resulting beverage is agreeable to the taste and beneficial to the human race when used temperately. Nothing can appear more fixed than the idea that a law prohibiting fermented beverages of 14 per cent or less alcoholic content conflicts with the laws of nature and is in the same category as a law seeking to regulate the time of rising and setting of the sun and moon. To all believers in Christianity it may be proper to remark that our present prohibition laws are in direct conflict with the teachings of Jesus Christ and His disciples. Christ lived among the Rechabites, who were the prohibitionists of His time, but rejected their teachings by totally ignoring them. He is nowhere quoted as approving abstinence from the use of wine, as taught by the Rechabites of His day, but miraculously made wine, gave it to His disciples, and inferentially stated there would be wine in heaven. He taught temperance, but not prohibition. Being the Son of God, He could not approve prohibition of a fermented beverage, because this would be contrary to a natural law made by His Father, the Creator of all natural laws.

If the divine Christ were to appear on earth to-day and attend a wedding feast in the Nation's Capital in these days of prohibition and again perform his miracle of transforming water into wine, some fanatical prohibition demagogue from a State where the tall corn grows and the strong booze flows, clothing himself in the robes of righteousness, would no doubt appear before a grand jury two years later and demand that the Saviour be indicted on no other evidence than a keen sense of smell and laboratory experience.

I would advise all of those within the sound of my voice, and those who read these remarks, who place the publication of the Anti-Saloon League above the Holy Bible, to read each issue of the *Liberal*, edited by that intellectual Christian editor, Charles A. Windle. Such reading on your part will be a boon to yourselves, the Nation, and your souls.

For the benefit of mankind I shall devote the rest of my time to reading words from the pen of Mr. Windle entitled "Prohibition or Christianity." These words clearly indicate that prohibition is wrong in principle, a failure as a remedy for the evils of intemperance, and ungodly and unchristian in character.

I challenge any member of "the church in action"—or, shall I say "the church in politics"—to defend the principle of

prohibition as Christian in character. No man living is equal to the task of refuting Mr. Windle's contentions and proving that compulsory total abstinence is a Bible doctrine, in harmony with the attitude of God and the example of Christ. Mr. Windle states:

For nearly 2,000 years the Christian religion has been a vital force in the world. While other creeds are older, their adherents more numerous, no other religion has done as much for the civilization, salvation, and progress of the human race.

Because of its great service to mankind, its possible fate deeply concerns millions of nonchurch members who believe that its destruction would be a calamity.

Christianity is the only religion that recognizes the dignity and sovereignty of the individual, inherent in the principle of personal liberty. This is the secret of its vitality and popularity.

Without personal liberty all ceremonies and forms of worship become hollow mockery. It is also the basis of all virtue and morality.

Despite God's omnipotent power and the infinite love of Christ, rather than violate this principle they would let the whole human race go to hell!

This is why prohibition, applied to the manufacture and temperate use of alcoholic beverages, can not be reconciled with any system of religion based upon this divine principle.

Consequently, compulsory total abstinence, like compulsory salvation from sin, is abhorrent to God. Both are unchristian.

God permits, and the Christian principle can not prohibit, the manufacture, sale, and temperate use of intoxicating liquors.

The intent of the eighteenth amendment is to establish the principle of compulsory total abstinence. The forces responsible for this heretical law have brought Christianity face to face with its greatest crisis.

To save Christianity prohibition must be destroyed.

Since the day of Pentecost the religion of Christ, based upon His ideals and the philosophy of love as opposed to force, has overcome many formidable enemies, but none to compare to the menace of the prohibition state, directed and dominated by organized fanatics who have written their intolerant creed into the organic law of the greatest and most powerful nation on this earth. In their efforts to compel all others to discard their own convictions and accept their heretical creed, prohibitionists have enlisted the armed forces of the United States and are waging a campaign of aggression and violence financed by the Government.

Had the prohibition state, like pagan Rome, declared open war against the Christian religion there would be less cause for alarm. Then all adherents of the faith could be aroused and united in its defense. To-day practically all evangelical churches are allied with the Anti-Saloon League in defense of the prohibition heresy. With few exceptions the other churches and their members are submissive, indifferent, and silent.

Nero the tyrant and Julian the apostate directed their attack against Christians, not against the fundamentals of their religion. Though backed by the might of the Roman Empire they failed because faith never surrenders to wild beasts nor can it be destroyed by fire and sword. Tigers could tear their bodies to shreds, but could not mutilate the ideals and principles for which they died.

In their vicious assaults upon the Christian religion, Voltaire, Paine, and Ingersoll brought to bear every weapon that satire, logic, and eloquence could invent, but they could not prevail because most soldiers of the cross remained loyal to the fundamentals of their faith.

Due to the character of its battlements, this sacred temple to Christ can not be destroyed by frontal attacks delivered in the open by avowed enemies. It is vulnerable only to foes within, hypocrites, heretics, and infidels in disguise, who make loud professions of loyalty to its founder, but for whose sacred ideals, doctrines, and divine example they display the utmost contempt. This is shown not by open declarations of treason but by preaching a spurious scheme of salvation based upon law, not love, and substituting a policeman's club for the cross of Christ.

Freedom of conscience is not only a Christian but an American ideal for which heroes and martyrs have died in every age and land. Freedom of conscience is involved in the attempt of the Government to create by force a state of mind favorable to prohibition. The citizen must abjectly surrender or become a rebel.

But the vital thing in this controversy is not whether our prohibition law shall be obeyed or defied, the citizen become a rebel or a cowardly hypocrite, but whether or not the principle underlying the eighteenth amendment is right or wrong, Christian or unchristian.

The importance of these questions can not be exaggerated.

If prohibition is right, if it is a Christian proposition, the wets have no standing in court.

If prohibition is wrong in principle and unchristian in doctrine and practice, nobody can invent an excuse for its existence or offer a sound argument in its defense.

This being true, it is an utter waste of time, energy, and money trying to prove that prohibition is either a success or a failure, that it

has multiplied or reduced crime, increased or decreased drunkenness, or that it has advanced or retarded national prosperity.

Even if the dries could prove their contentions as to the beneficial effects of prohibition, they would lose their case, unless they could also prove the principle to be right and Christian.

If the wets could sustain their contentions as to its evil effects, but could not prove prohibition to be wrong in principle and unchristian in character, they would be forced to surrender.

Arguments based upon the good or evil effects of a policy may be legitimate, but they are subordinate and incidental to the main question involving the character of the principle upon which the policy is based.

The one thing that dims the prospect for an early repeal of the eighteenth amendment is the fact that most of the wet leaders and newspaper publishers opposed to prohibition are inclined to dodge the religious phase of the controversy. They hesitate to arouse the wrath of the Anti-Saloon leaders—"the church in action"—by challenging the right of its leaders to speak for prohibition in the name of the Christ.

The idea that prohibitionists held a divine commission to impose compulsory total abstinence upon the American people was responsible for the ratification of the eighteenth amendment.

Destroy the delusion that prohibition is a Christian proposition, and our fight can be won.

What should have been done 15 years ago to prevent the triumph of prohibition must be done now to secure its repeal.

By avoiding debate dry leaders are able to maintain the false assumption that prohibition can be defended on the grounds named in my challenge. Failure of wet leaders to force the issue is responsible for the prestige that goes with the idea that prohibition preachers are champions of Christian temperance while their opponents are defenders of drunkenness; that they represent Christ on the question at issue, while all who antagonize prohibition speak for the devil.

In this article I base the case against prohibition entirely upon Biblical authority for four reasons:

First, most prohibitionists are professed Christians, and the Book which they pretend to revere as the "inspired word of God" is still the "best seller."

Second, the Bible is the official textbook of the Christian ministry, found in almost every home and in the rooms of all leading hotels.

Third, it is accepted by all Protestant fundamentalists as the supreme authority on all questions of faith and morals.

Fourth, many of the great daily newspapers that support the eighteenth amendment carry a Bible text at the head of their editorial columns, oblivious to the fact that prohibition exists in absolute defiance of scriptural authority.

There are but three standards by which the Christian character of any proposition, social, religious, or political, may be determined: The position of the early church, the Bible, and the example of Christ. No proposition in conflict with the attitude of the Deity as revealed in the Bible or that is contrary to the example of Christ can be Christian.

Among all the people who drink intoxicants, the drunkard is the exception. This proves that the fault is in the man, not the thing abused. God prohibits nothing that is not evil per se. He enjoins temperance, but permits the use of every good thing, even when excess may result in great evil.

No general law of God is, and no law of man should be based upon exceptions by which the innocent many may be penalized for the guilty few.

This being true, the existence of the prohibition state is not only a repudiation of the Christian religion but a challenge to God!

THE HOLY BIBLE

The Bible is either what Christians claim it to be—a God-inspired book and the final authority on questions of doctrine, faith, and morals—or it is what Bob Ingersoll said it was, a literary forgery, having no more authority to bind the conscience or control the actions of men than any other work of fiction.

Among present-day Christians we have two Bible cults, known as "modernists" and "fundamentalists."

Modernism is a modified form of infidelity. Quoting literal texts from the Bible to a modernist is like administering medicine to the dead. If he happens to be a prohibitionist, what the Bible says on the question or what Christ did at Cana means absolutely nothing.

Catholics are fundamentalists and with few exceptions are opposed to prohibition. Their position is determined by the Scriptures as interpreted by the Pope and church councils.

Protestant fundamentalists are supposed to accept the Bible as the revealed will of God, requiring no interpretation where the language is plain and specific. Where it speaks in parables, allegories, or prophecies, they accord to the individual the right of private interpretation, which is the fundamental basis of Protestantism.

A God who would write an infallible book and forget to reveal or deliberately misstate His position on a great moral issue would be a monster. But the divine attitude on any given question can not be determined by biblical texts capable of contradictory interpretations. They must be plain and specific. There are many such texts bearing

upon the question at issue, but we invite your attention to only a few. If the Bible is the word of God, one would be sufficient. If it is not His word, a thousand would be equally meaningless.

The first of these is found in Deuteronomy xiv, 26, and reads:

"And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink."

This text is not only clear but specific. What God here specifically permits, the eighteenth amendment emphatically forbids. Under our most unchristian prohibition laws it is criminal to comply with God's permission. This text places God on one side of the drink question and the dries on the other. The position would be consistent for an infidel, but for a Christian it is ridiculous.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit one question there?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I regret I can not. You can see that I am trying to get through so that the Committee on Appropriations can come on and transact its business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TREADWAY). The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin (reading):

This divine permission to buy wine and strong drink can not be canceled by human laws.

By what authority do prohibitionists, claiming to be Christians, assume the right to forbid what their God permits?

Their authority is no greater than that of the thief and murderer to repeal the Ten Commandments and permit what God forbids!

If divine authority is not a myth, this text must stand just as it reads.

While it stands no prohibitionist can prove that he is in harmony with the Deity on the drink question.

Any argument based upon distortion of this or other texts tending to show that God did not mean what He said when He gave specific permission to buy "wine and strong drink," would not only confirm the contentions of Paine and Ingersoll, but effect what they failed to accomplish—the destruction of the Christian religion.

The Hebrew word, here translated "wine," is "yayin," meaning "the fermented juice of the grape." It is never applied to grape juice when unfermented. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, the root word from which "yayin" is derived means "wailing and lamentation," which may result from excessive use.

According to the same authority, "sheker," translated "strong drink," comes from the root word used as a synonym for "drunkenness."

Despite the intoxicating character of these beverages, God, if we accept the Bible as His word, permits their purchase and use. If drunkenness, wailing, and lamentations follow excessive use, it is the fault of the user, not the drink; the exception, not the rule.

Its conflict with the divine order makes prohibition, backed by the State, infidelity's greatest and most dangerous ally.

If infidels have always been right, why waste more money to build churches and other religious institutions? Why not discharge all ministers and convert church property into cash and either give it to the poor or use it to hire more prohibition gunmen?

If righteousness, or the virtue of temperance, can be imparted by law, clergymen are useless and the salvation business should be turned over to the legislatures.

"If righteousness can come by the law, Christ is dead in vain." This is what St. Paul said. If Christ died in vain, there is no excuse for the Christian ministry.

Such is the inexorable logic and effect of prohibition.

The second text to which your attention is invited will be found in Ecclesiastes ix, 7. It reads:

"Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God now accepteth thy works."

Prohibition ministers will find it easier to prove their God to be a demon than to harmonize their views on the drink question with His position as revealed in these texts.

That He told His people to drink an intoxicating beverage as a reward of righteousness is proven by the use of "yayin," the original word for "wine," never applied to the fruit of the vine until fermentation is complete. The little word "merry" in the text is also significant. There is no conversation, much less merriment, in grape juice.

No person who has a sane and reverent conception of the Deity could believe that if the prohibition principle applied to the use of alcoholic beverages is right, He could specifically permit its purchase, much less tell His people to drink wine as a reward of righteousness.

Under the Jones law he who makes it possible for anyone to take advantage of this divine permission and reward commits a felony, punishable by a fine of \$10,000 and five years in prison.

Dr. Clarence True Wilson, with other dry leaders, demand that this law be amended to make the buyer equally guilty. They insist upon widening the already impassable gulf between themselves and their God on the drink question.

To dries who have more respect for Volstead than for divine authority these texts mean no more than their religion means to God.

Leaving all such to their delusions, I appeal to sincere men and women who profess the Christian religion. Many having been deceived by dry preachers honestly believe prohibition to be a Christian proposition.

The fixed attitude of the Deity on the question of personal liberty and prohibition is determined by the texts above submitted, which show that He not only gave His people permission to buy "wine and strong drink" but told them to drink wine as a reward of righteousness.

His attitude makes it absolutely impossible for a Christian to defend the principle of prohibition without becoming a traitor to God.

Having determined and defined the attitude of the Deity as revealed in the Old Testament, we shall next consider the example of Christ, as recorded in the New.

THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST

All fundamentalists accept the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which precludes the possibility of conflict between God the Father and God the Son on any question. They also agree that the Old and New Testaments must stand or fall together.

In Luke vii, 33-34, we learn from Christ's own lips where He stood on the question of drinking intoxicating beverages. Contrasting His own with the position of John the Baptist, Jesus said:

"For John the Baptist came, neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say he hath a devil."

The New Testament was written in Greek. The original word for wine is "oinos," corresponding to the Hebrew "yayin," "the fermented juice of the grape." This forces us to the conclusion that John was a teetotaler, but Jesus was not, for in verse 34 he says:

"The Son of Man is come, eating and drinking; and ye say, behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber."

But for the fact that Jesus made both bread and wine a part of His diet, this comparison would be meaningless. The wine (oinos) He drank was the kind from which John abstained. This confirms the conclusion that while total abstinence is Johnlike it is not Christlike.

"Winebibber" is the Biblical term for "drunkard." The pretext upon which His enemies based their false charge of drunkenness was the fact that Jesus drank what everybody knew to be an intoxicating beverage. Like their successors, the modern prohibitionists, they failed to distinguish the difference between drinking in moderation and drunkenness, between use and abuse. These dry Pharisees, who called Jesus a "winebibber" held the doctrines of Pythagoras, whose laws made death the penalty for drinking wine. The fanaticism and intolerance of modern dries is a heritage from the time of Christ. The centuries have left prohibitionists unchanged either in their methods or principles.

The Christian position on the question, as determined by the example of Christ, also remains unchanged by time. That example is as immutable as His divinity.

This makes the conflict between Christianity and prohibition irrepressible. It will continue until one or the other is destroyed. It remains for professed Christians to determine which shall survive.

At the time of Christ prohibition fanaticism was rampant in Palestine as it is to-day in the United States. Jesus won the enmity of these dry Pharisees because He denounced them as hypocrites and called them a "generation of vipers." They tried to get even by calling Him a "winebibber." He told the truth. They lied.

The divine Christ, who did not think it wrong even for a God to drink wine in moderation, being invited to a wedding feast gladly accepted, knowing that an intoxicating beverage would be served to all guests.

This fact made possible the performance of His first miracle.

Upon this occasion the wine supplied by the host gave out before the feast ended. He misjudged the capacity of his guests, who demanded more wine.

The sainted mother of Jesus placed their demand before Him. Not being a prohibitionist He neither condemned the host for serving wine nor reproved the guests for exhausting the supply and asking for more.

He did what no prohibitionist would have done—performed a miracle to supply the demand for an intoxicating beverage. The eighteenth amendment makes it criminal to do what He did.

This historic record requires no interpretation. It is either true, just as related, or it is false. If it happened, Christ was not opposed to the manufacture and use of alcoholic beverages. If it never happened, the Bible is a fraud and the Christian religion a delusion.

Upon the assumption that the Bible is an inspired Book, Jesus the Son of God, and the Christian religion a divine plan of salvation, the miracle of Cana reveals Christ as an antiprohibitionist, which makes all prohibitionists anti-Christ. This is inescapable.

That He made an intoxicating beverage from water, not grape juice, makes no difference. The important thing is not the original element but the intoxicating character of the product.

Dries who contend that Jesus transformed water into grape juice are confuted by the fact that "oinos" is the only term for wine appearing in the text. As it is never applied to the fruit of the vine before fermentation is complete, it was the only word the inspired writer could use in describing the effect of the water's miraculous transformation.

It is ridiculous to assume that an inspired writer could use the wrong term to designate the kind of wine Jesus made. It discredits the theory of Biblical inspiration.

There was also present an official known as "the ruler of the feast." It was his business to serve wine to all guests, but prevent debauchery. As was customary, he served the "best" or the most intoxicating wine first, and when any guest commenced to show signs of intoxication, he gave him a "worse" or weaker kind of wine—never grape juice. When the ruler tasted the wine Jesus made he sent for the bridegroom and said unto him:

"Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse, but thou hast kept the good wine until now." (John ii, 10.)

Naturally, if the "good wine" served first would not intoxicate, there would have been no reason for serving a "worse" or weaker kind of wine "when men have well drunk."

On this occasion the ruler simply reproved the bridegroom for his apparent reversal of the general custom by serving the most intoxicating kind last, which was the "good wine" that Jesus made.

Had Jesus converted water into grape juice, as dries contend, it would have been unnecessary for Him to send it to the ruler for distribution.

Had he made a "worse wine" it would never have received the compliments of the ruler, and that official would not have summoned the bridegroom for reproval. Verse 10 could not have been written.

No weasel-worded interpretation of this text can conceal these facts. No juggling with original terms that do not appear in the text can prove that Jesus, in response to a demand for real wine, perpetrated a fraud by giving the guests a substitute for what they wanted.

Just before His crucifixion Jesus completed His mission on earth by instituting the most sacred of all religious ceremonies known as the Lord's Supper, or Holy Sacrament, in the observance of which He prescribed the use of wine (oinos).

For the honor of their Christ, and in defense of this Divine institution, true Christians must condemn and reject the prohibition concept of wine, called by Mahomet in the Koran "the abomination of the works of Satan," and denounced by prohibition preachers as "liquid damnation."

A devil might, but no sane person, much less the incarnate Son of God, would, in instituting the holiest of all religious sacraments, make use of such a hellish concoction.

If the Christian religion is not a fraud, Jesus Christ was divine, possessing infinite wisdom, incapable of making a mistake or taking a position on any question of principle contrary to truth, reason, and morality.

Doctor Cherrington, who thinks that "Christ belonged to a lower Mediterranean order of civilization," is editor of the American Issue, official organ of the Anti-Saloon League, and director of its educational campaign. Christ was the incarnation of the highest type of civilization this earth has ever known or will ever know. The more nearly men conform to His ideals and standards the more civilized the race becomes.

Doctor Cherrington and these Charleston ministers, for the sake of prohibition, have not only denied the faith but are worse than Bob Ingersoll. The great infidel lectured on The Mistakes of Moses, but left to prohibition heretics the "honor" of naming the "mistakes" of Christ. From Cherrington, the mouthpiece of the Anti-Saloon League, we "learn" that the Son of God belonged to a lower Mediterranean order of civilization. To belong to the upper or higher "Mediterranean order of civilization," one had to be a prohibitionist like the Pharisees and hypocrites, who not only pointed out the "mistakes" of Jesus but denounced Him as a "winebibber."

When professed Christians let their zeal for prohibition place them in such a ridiculous position we can only say, in the language of Oscar Wilde, that—

"None can tell to what red hell
Their sightless souls may stray."

No sane person can accept Christ as the Son of God except upon the hypothesis that whatever He said was true, and everything He did was right.

Prove that His philosophy was unsound, His teaching false, His example bad for mankind, and you transform the grandest character in history into the greatest faker and deceiver that ever preyed upon the credulity of man. Discredit its founder and the Christian religion becomes the master delusion of the ages, its adherents idolators, its ministers heathen priests, and its houses of worship nothing more than Pagan temples consecrated to ignorance and falsehood.

In presenting the case against prohibition from the Biblical or Christian standpoint, I have refrained from quoting evidence based upon human authority, although the preponderance of such evidence supports my contention. Great authorities of the early church, like St. Chrysostom, St. Irenaeus, and St. Augustine, are all on record against prohibition. To these I could add the testimony and record of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, founders of the principal Protestant sects, and that of the greatest modern theologians, representing a vast majority of all professed Christians. It should be remembered that neither the Episco-

pal, Lutheran, nor the Catholic Church have ever been identified with the prohibition crusade.

The dries, in defense of prohibition, could call but one witness among the early fathers, Tatian. He was not only condemned by the church but denounced by St. Irenaeus as "the father of all heresies." In Apostolic Canon 51, his followers, who refused to renounce their prohibition heresy, were excommunicated. To Tatian's "evidence" dries could add the testimony of such prohibition heretics as Dr. Clarence True Wilson, Pussyfoot Johnson, and Billy Sunday. But all such evidence, based upon human authority, for or against prohibition, would be worthless unless supported by the practice of the early church and in accord with the attitude of the Delty and the example of Christ as revealed in the Holy Bible.

I may state that most of my statement is a quotation from the pen of this gentleman, Mr. Charles A. Windle, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show. No living man is capable of presenting the pertinent views in my judgment as clearly as Mr. Windle, and that is why I have quoted him at length.

Judged by these three infallible standards, the record convicts all prohibitionists who profess the Christian religion as heretics in open rebellion against the highest authority, human and divine.

Their position is not only untenable but ridiculous.

The effect of their heresy is fraught with infinite harm to America and to the Christian religion.

Nonchurch members, comprising 60 per cent of our population, can not be induced by them to revere a book whose authority has been repudiated by the state at the dictation of prohibitionists who falsely pretend to believe it to be the "inspired word of God." Having repudiated the example of Christ, they have canceled their power and forfeited their right and commission to teach others in His name.

The utter absurdity of their position is stressed by the fact that if Jesus were to return to earth and reenact the miracle of Cana at Washington, the laws for which so-called dry Christians are responsible would brand Him as a criminal. Under direction of the President and Congress, prohibition agents armed with automatics and sawed-off shotguns, would raid the wedding feast, arrest the founder of the Christian religion, and send Him to prison as a bootlegger.

Since Congress made it criminal to supply a demand for intoxicating beverages, any citizen who dares to follow the example of Christ can be fined \$10,000 and imprisoned for five years. If this law is based upon a right principle, Jesus did wrong when He performed the miracle of Cana. If He did right, the prohibition principle is wrong.

This logic is irrefutable.

Proof that He did right will destroy prohibition.

Proof that He did wrong would utterly discredit the Christian religion.

In view of these facts, the aggressive, brutal arrogance of the dries and the silence and indifference of Christians who are not prohibitionists is startling, astounding, and all-but incredible!

Is it due to a lack of knowledge on the question? If so, the responsibility rests upon liberal leaders who have persistently refused to center their campaign against prohibition on the religious phase of the controversy and carry their fight to the people. Until this is done, all their efforts to repeal the eighteenth amendment will prove futile.

On the other hand, if professed Christians opposed to prohibition know the facts and refuse to rise in protest against its deadly menace to the Christian religion, it will prove that old-time reverence for the Bible, zeal for the "faith once delivered to the saints," and loyalty to Christ have practically ceased to exist. It would be impossible to imagine a more tragic spectacle than one in which Christians would continue to attend church services, contribute millions of dollars to build great institutions of worship and education, and sing loud hosannas to the King, but stand idly by, refusing to lift a hand when their Christ is crucified on the prohibition cross!

One of the strangest verdicts on record was rendered at the trial of Christ. During the feast of the Passover it was customary for the governor to give some noted prisoner his liberty. Desiring to favor Jesus, Pilate left to the high priests and people the decision as to whether He or Barabbas, a murderer, should be released. The mob cried, "Release Barabbas! Crucify Christ!"

Once more the Son of God is on trial. This time before the American people.

The choice is between the Jesus of temperance and the Barabbas of prohibition.

You must choose between prohibition and the Christian religion. You can not have both, for they are eternal opposites.

An unbridgeable gulf separates one from the other, with God and Christ standing on one side and the dries on the other.

Where do you stand?

Remember, it was Jesus who said, "He that is not for me is against me."

[Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wish the gentleman would permit a pause in the ecclesiastical side for a moment and allow me to comment on the actual parliamentary situation. I call the attention of the House to the fact that there seems to be confusion at the present moment in the ranks of the dries. We read this morning a statement from the leadership of the House dries respecting parliamentary procedure expected to be followed in considering the so-called prohibition legislative programs. This morning we heard a statement from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], one of the champions of prohibition, seemingly seeking to explain his stand and endeavoring to show harmony in their ranks. Now we ask, Are they for the legislative commission recommended by President Hoover, or are they against it?

If they are for it, I suggest the way to bring it to the floor is to invoke the rule to discharge the committee. It is interesting on the tenth anniversary of prohibition to perceive the confusion that exists in the ranks of the dries.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time so that the Committee on Appropriations may proceed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLADAY). The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, following the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he may address the House for 45 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JOHN M. ROBSON

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON] is to take the oath this afternoon as a Senator of the United States. We regret exceedingly to lose him from the House because he has been a most valuable Member, but we recognize that the Senate needs him worse. [Applause.] So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky may be recognized for such time as he desires in order that he may give a parting word to his colleagues. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, Governor Sampson, of Kentucky, has advised me that he has appointed me United States Senator to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Senator Sackett. I am not unmindful of the very great honor to be one of the representatives of that proud Commonwealth in the United States Senate. No Kentuckian could refuse such a call to service and honor, and I have advised the governor of my acceptance.

However, one of my fine old colored friends in my district, according to the story now being told, holds a different view, as you will observe from the following conversation:

Mista Congressman, what's all this talk I heer among de white folks an' de black folks about you gwine to quit dat high place in Congress an' go down to de Senate?

Well, Uncle Bill, I understand that I shall soon be appointed to the Senate.

Now, Mista Congressman, you has been in dat high place in Congress 'leben years. You shorely, shorely, shorely ain't gwine to condesend yo'self an' step down frum dat high place in Congress to de Senate is you?

[Laughter.]

I have asked the indulgence of the House to-day for a few moments to express to the officers and Members my deep sense of appreciation for the many courtesies extended to me, and I wish to thank each one of you here and now for your congratulations and good wishes. Throughout the nearly 11 years of my service no Member of this House, either Democrat or Republican, has shown me the slightest discourtesy. Mere words can not express to you my real feelings of appreciation.

In a representative government like ours we need two great militant parties. Both parties have rendered outstanding service to the Republic and have fully justified their existence. We need a militant, forceful Democratic Party. While many of you good Democrats will not agree with me, I am sure, yet I feel that it would be a mistake for your party to become strong

enough to elect a President or the Congress; but if fate should so determine, I am sure that Democrats and Republicans would rejoice to see the capable, honest, earnest, active, splendid Democratic minority leader, the Hon. JOHN GARNER, of the State of Texas, become the Speaker of the House of Representatives [applause], and I could name several Members of the House of Representatives here, among them the Hon. CORDELL HULL, of Tennessee, who, in my honest opinion, could do as good a job as President as any Democrat in the country.

MANY CHANGES

Before arising to speak I was trying to visualize these 11 years. It seems to me but yesterday that I became a Member of the House, yet in that time four great Presidents have occupied the White House—Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover—great Americans all. Each one, in my honest judgment, had no desire except to serve, as he believed, the best interests of our country. And there comes to my memory that great American and former Kentuckian, the Hon. Champ Clark, former Speaker and Democratic leader. I can still see as clearly to-day as I did when he made his last speech on the floor of this House the fine face and fine personality of the Hon. Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina, your minority leader for many years. Somehow he impressed me as being one of the cleverest and best debaters I have ever heard; and then, more recently, the Hon. Finis Garrett, of Tennessee, who would adorn any great lawmaking body.

I consider myself most fortunate to have been privileged to sit in this great body with that fine old Republican statesman and patriot, Uncle Joe Cannon, and it was no small honor to sit alongside of that greatest of all parliamentarians, James R. Mann, and to have served with Martin Madden, James W. Good, and many other men on both sides of this aisle of great distinction.

During these 11 years I have had the comradeship of those who wore the blue and the gray, those who followed the great Teddy, Admiral Dewey, and carried the Stars and Stripes to victory on Flanders Field—yes; those who have gone out and brought back the Stars and Stripes in honor and in victory in all the struggles of our country on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea since 1861.

While my father was one of Lincoln's men in that great struggle between the sections, I know that my service here with the gallant Major STEPMAN, of North Carolina, who followed the fortunes of the Confederacy, has enriched my whole life.

COURAGE, ABILITY, HONOR, AND PATRIOTISM

I am sure there is no group of men and women in any law-making body of the world, or any group of men or women in civil life, who possess more ability, more real courage, a higher sense of honor, or loftier patriotism than the men and women with whom I have had the honor to associate in the House of Representatives during the years of my service. It has been my privilege here to mix and mingle with men and women who have won great distinction as lawyers, judges, doctors, teachers, ministers, captains of industry, masters of finance, bankers, farmers, leaders of the workers, and, in fact, every activity of life. While we may have differed on matters of governmental policy, yet in the main I found that each and every Member of this House has been most sincere in trying to serve the best interest of the people of his district and State and promote the general welfare of our country. It has been my pleasure to form friendships that will be a joy to me throughout the remainder of my life.

JOY AND REGRETS

But if I did not, as a Member of the United States Senate, still have certain privileges of the floor of the House to visit my old friends and to watch their work, and if I were going to a body where they were all strangers, I should feel the deepest regret, but in the Senate I shall find one of my old professors, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and one of my old schoolmates, the fine Senator of West Virginia [Mr. HARTFIELD], and I shall also find there many of those who served with honor and distinction in this House, but have become Members of the Senate. I refer to Senators PATTERSON, CONNALLY, BARKLEY, HAYDEN, SCHALL, CARAWAY, GREENE, HAWES, MCCULLOCH, STEPHENS, TYDINGS, and our former Speaker, Senator GILLET.

I have no illusion about the new work that I shall undertake. It will be in the Senate as it is in the House. We can not get honor for ourselves out of these great offices only in so far as we put honor into them by faithful, honest service devoted to the ideals and principles of this Republic, and serve the best interest of all of the people of the States and promote the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

The least that I can wish for you, my friends, is health and continued success of service for our beloved country. It is a very, very great honor to serve in either branch of the greatest

lawmaking body of the finest and best country that the world has ever seen.

Again thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and each and every one of my colleagues for your graciousness, for your friendship, may I bid you farewell.

MADAM SPEAKER

When I first became a Member of the House there was, as I recall, but one gentlewoman a Member. Now we have seven. All of them serve splendidly, honestly, and efficiently their respective districts and our country.

I am not a prophet, or the son of a prophet, but you young men of the House if you continue in the service need not be surprised some day to arise in your place and address the Chair as Madam Speaker. Of course, this can not happen so long as that capable parliamentarian, ripened statesman, courteous, honest, all-around good fellow, our own Nick, continues to be a Member of this body. [Applause.]

I wish each one of you a long, happy, and prosperous life, and with these words permit me to bid you all a fond, loving farewell. [Applause, the Members rising.]

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7955, the War Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the War Department appropriation bill, with Mr. HOOPER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7955, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

OUR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT STILL GROWS

A ceremony was held in this city on July 24, 1929, culminating in the formal announcement by our President that the Pact of Paris was in effect—the nations agreeing thereby to renounce war and settle all disputes by pacific means. President Hoover concluded his statement thus:

I have caused the said treaty to be made public to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and citizens thereof.

On July 23, 1929, President Hoover had said:

The American people should understand that current expenditure on strictly military activities of the Army and Navy constitutes the largest military budget of any nation in the world to-day, and at a time when there is less real danger of extensive disturbance to peace than at any time in half a century. * * * Our whole situation is certainly modified by the Kellogg pact.

At the same time the following table of combined military and naval expenditures for the four leading nations was given out. I have copied it from the New York Times for July 24, 1929:

<i>United Kingdom</i>	
1927-28 (actual expenses)-----	\$570,758,400
1928-29 (actual expenses)-----	551,464,200
1929-30 (estimates)-----	547,274,600
<i>France</i>	
1928-29 (estimates)-----	407,915,000
1929-30 (estimates)-----	523,241,000
<i>Japan</i>	
1927-28 (actual expenditures)-----	212,333,000
1928-29 (actual expenditures)-----	224,352,000
1929-30 (estimates)-----	235,351,000
<i>United States</i>	
1927-28 (actual expenditures)-----	624,600,000
1928-29 (actual expenditures)-----	684,700,000
1929-30 (estimates)-----	741,000,000

With this went the statement by the President that estimates for 1933 indicated an expenditure of \$803,000,000—

An increase of \$120,000,000 over the last fiscal year and \$224,000,000 over four years ago. All of which compares with a total of \$266,000,000, the average pre-war total for the combined military services of the Army and Navy, or an estimated increase by 1933 of \$530,000,000 over pre-war.

At the conclusion of the conversations between President Hoover and Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald they issued a joint statement, published widely in the press:

In signing the Paris peace pact 56 nations have agreed that all disputes shall be settled by pacific means. Both our Governments

resolve to accept the peace pact not only as a declaration of good intentions but as a positive obligation to direct national policy in accordance with its pledge.

In his message to the opening of this Congress President Hoover said:

I recommend that Congress give earnest consideration to the possibilities of prudent action which will give relief from our continuously mounting expenditures.

President Hoover later issued his own summary of our National Budget, showing that 72 per cent of our Federal funds go to paying for past wars and preparation for future wars, while only 8 per cent is used for the machinery of government. During the summer at the President's suggestion a commission was appointed to survey our Military Establishment with a view to reducing expenditures.

In view of these facts and pronouncements, the citizenry of the country has hoped that this Congress might lighten the burden of our military budget. This appropriation bill is a great surprise and a tragic disappointment.

This bill represents a substantial increase over the bill for 1930 and is entirely out of accord with public hopes for economy and the current trend toward peace. Congress appropriated \$318,086,769.59 for the past fiscal year and \$331,338,442 for 1930. This bill allows \$337,858,194 for strictly military activities for 1931. Let us examine the appropriations for the various activities of our Military Establishment.

THE REGULAR ARMY GROWS

On June 30, 1929, the Regular Army had 11,943 commissioned officers, 1,138 warrant officers, 145 retired officers on active duty, and 117,725 enlisted men. The Philippine Scouts had 87 officers and 6,491 enlisted men. There were in addition 734 Army nurses, 29 contract surgeons, and 850 cadets in the United States Military Academy, making a total of 139,142.

Under the terms of this bill the Regular Army will have an enlisted strength in excess of 118,750 men and an officer strength in excess of 12,000 men. The Philippine Scouts had in 1929 a strength of 6,000. The 1930 bill provides for 6,500. This bill provides for an average of 6,500, which means a number in excess of 6,500.

This bill increases the previous limit of Army officers 200 by providing that the average number will be 12,000, whereas in the 1930 bill the outstanding limit was 12,000.

The increase in the enlisted strength has been brought about by certain forms of legerdemain:

First. By providing for the first time for an average number of 118,750, whereas heretofore it was not to exceed 118,750.

Second. In the determination of the average limit of 118,750 men, those sick not in line of duty, men absent without leave, and similar cases are to be deducted, and thus an average in excess of 118,750 will always be carried. As expressed by General Summerall:

We have made this estimate so as to carry as many men as possible within our allowance of an average of 118,750.

Third. The enlisted men are graded and rated in this bill on the basis of 125,000 men rather than 118,750. This change brings about increased appropriations to the extent of over \$700,000. Of course, all this is preparatory to a drive which will be shortly made to increase the enlisted strength of the Army to 125,000 men. This is the entering wedge. It is more than that; the program is now well under way.

The last appropriation bill provided for about 60,000 civilians. This one provides for at least 63,266, and I seriously doubt if this includes them all. It does not include those in the nonmilitary branches. These civilians are scattered throughout the Army. Their salaries are comparable with men in other lines of work in civilian life. They are paid much more than the average enlisted man and are skilled in their various lines of work. As a class they are superior to the enlisted men, and because of this the Army is made much more effective as an organization. Their presence also relieves the officers of many duties that they would otherwise have to perform.

The officers of all classes will number 14,648. This includes 1,264 cadets at the United States Military Academy, 146 retired officers on active duty, and 1,038 warrant officers. The enlisted men, including Philippine Scouts and 734 Army nurses, will be 127,234. This will place the enlisted strength of the Regular Army at 120,000 and it will exceed this number. The civilian experts, mechanics, and other civilian employees, including 29 contract surgeons, amount to 63,295, making a total Regular Army strength of 205,177 as compared to last year's figures of 199,142. However, these increases in the Military Establishment are about the usual yearly increase. There were

about 5,000 more provided for in 1930 than there were in 1929, and this bill provides for 6,035 more than was provided for in 1930. Of course, the Army is cute in its methods of bringing about these increases. They bring them about gradually, and usually by a "nudging-up process" in such a way that Congress knows nothing about what happens until after it is done. While some of us may not admire their methods, we are obliged to recognize their effectiveness. They get what they want just the same.

The pay of the Army shows an increase on the face of the bill of \$827,811 over last year's bill. The increase, however, is very much larger than this, for many pay items are shifted to other activities.

For the housing of the Army, \$14,062,860 is appropriated in this bill, or a total of \$51,256,759 appropriated during the last 5-year period.

And, by the way, I venture the assertion that by the time this bill has passed the House this item will be increased by \$2,000,000 and by a further contract authorization. A still more formidable housing program is in the offing. It will authorize \$180,200,593 more. The houses that have been and are being built are better than those of us in civilian life, whose positions are comparable to Army officers, are accustomed to provide for ourselves; but this is in line with our policy of extravagance on all matters affecting national defense; and the new program will be O. K'd without a murmur.

THE ARMY MUST PREPARE FOR DECREASES

In such a gigantic sum as this bill carries there are many items, and the layman is quite bewildered in trying to understand where the money goes and whether it is wisely spent. However, it is the business of civilians to control the military policy of our country and responsibility rests ultimately upon this Congress for deciding what we shall put into our Army. But the Military Establishment has become so large and so complex that even the members of our subcommittee find it impossible to appraise properly the various requests for funds. The make-up of the bill is awful and an understanding of it takes months of study. It should be reframed and appropriations should be made by functions rather than by divisions in the War Department. The sums of money and the ways in which these sums are spent are quite beyond our grasp. We can readily understand the desires of our military officers in their commendable enthusiasm for constantly expanding their fighting machine, but the Members of this Congress must set the limits to that expansion. I fear that we are too much inclined to accept without question the plans and appeals submitted to us by these military servants. We must determine a limit beyond which they can not go. The military must prepare themselves for the inevitable decreases and must make their plans accordingly. Particularly we must seek ways of eliminating useless expenditure, and this will not occur as long as the public is unmindful of mounting appropriations.

MILITARY MEN CLING TO OLD TOYS

Although this Congress must leave to military men the general task of building the military machine, it seems to me that we should recognize the limitations and weaknesses of Army men in such matters. In the first place, soldiering is a very old profession and has some very rigid traditions and attitudes. Army officers are not always awake to changed conditions and often stick to old methods until forced to give them up. Even Theodore Roosevelt once said on this point:

It was melancholy for me to see how fossilized and lacking in ambition, and generally useless, were most of the men of my age and over, who had served their lives in the Army.

While this judgment is severe we must recognize the fundamental conservatism of the military men and prevent their blocking progress.

So we should not be shocked to learn that this bill provides for the maintenance of an ancient and famous, not to say beautiful and delightful arm of the service called the Cavalry. Now, I love that graceful animal, the horse, and if I were a little younger and slimmer I would probably enjoy playing polo—if a bountiful government supplied the mounts. But just because I do love the horse, I hate to think of seeing him dragged into modern warfare. The pastures will not be green for him when airplanes soar overhead, tanks rush past, and gas covers all.

MACHINES IN MODERN WAR

Tests were made last summer upon a tank that can travel across open fields at 40 or 50 miles an hour and along a road at over 70 miles an hour. In this connection an engineer said yesterday he had driven this tank 90 miles an hour and that it was possible for it to go 120 miles an hour.

Here are a few sentences describing this tank taken from an article by Maj. C. C. Benson, an expert on tanks, in the *Infantry Journal* for September, 1929:

At 25 miles per hour the machine goes over a 12-inch log with scarcely a ripple. * * * The machine made a trip of 144 miles between breakfast and lunch. * * * The driver can operate his steering levers with the pressure of a single finger; he can turn the machine about in half its length going either backward or forward, and can cut figure eights at a speed that would shame an international polo pony. * * * Under skilled hands this machine has the agility of a wild cat. * * * It can cross a 7-foot trench, climb a 45° slope, surmount a 3-foot vertical wall, crush barbed-wire entanglements, and crash through underbrush. In bad weather it can operate more effectively than any other combat agency. It can be made impervious to gas attacks. * * * In swampy ground, where a man or a mule would bog down, the Christie would pull through. * * *

This machine can be used as a tractor or a cargo carrier. It is strong enough to carry up to 12 tons and could be used with terrible effects to carry tons of casualty-producing chemical agents into the enemy lines. * * * The heaviest mobile artillery pieces could be moved about and supplied with ammunition far more rapidly than is possible with present means.

This same engineer said out here that he had driven it through 4 feet of mud that it was impossible for a horse or mule to go through.

Maj. Gen. C. C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance, testified before our subcommittee that this machine could go anywhere any wheeled vehicle could go. In other words, it could go on its own power anywhere horses or mules could take a vehicle and many places they could not go.

THE ARMY KEEPS THE HORSE

And in spite of this performance many officers still insist that the horse is going to be indispensable in future warfare.

Of course, there is the social side of the argument for the horse. The Cavalry shows not only the conservatism of the military but also the romance. It is very easy for men who have ridden splendid horses all their lives to hope and believe that in some way their learning to ride better and better will have some usefulness in war time. But this Congress should call a halt on such use of public moneys. So long as we are generous there will be many of these very questionable "trimmings" for the Army.

The Regular Army had this year 22,886 horses. To this must be added 2,487 private mounts maintained at Government cost. Mind you, these are only nominally private mounts. They cost the United States Government more to maintain than the Government-owned horses. This bill carries \$247,500 for purchasing 1,500 more horses and \$150,000 for breeding horses for the future. At least 2,160 of these are used for playing polo. In fact, horseback riding, fox hunting, coon hunting, and drag hunting are very popular in the Army; popular with the officers and with their lady folks. The allowance of horses in the Regular Army is 21,500. The committee has therefore exceeded the needs of the Army in horses, according to the Army's estimate of horse needs.

Please remember the above data on horses applies only to the Regular Army. The other branches of the service have additional animals. I truly believe that had there been a division of men using blow guns in our Army somewhere in the dim past, the General Staff would ask this Congress to maintain that invaluable weapon for future emergencies. They would probably find many arguments to justify granting sums for bigger and better blow-gun regiments.

THE AIR CORPS CLIMBS

The bill for 1929 listed \$25,875,041 under the Air Corps budget. The bill for 1930 contained \$33,578,683, labeled Air Corps, but the real amount was \$67,579,358. This bill grants a total of \$72,833,883.

In view of the rapid expansion of civil aviation and the tremendous technical progress being made there, I feel that there is much unnecessary expense connected with the Air Corps in the purchase of corps planes and in many other ways. Much of the testing and experimenting done by the Air Corps must surely duplicate similar work being done by civilians. This bill carries an item of \$17,573,723 for the purchase of new planes. Because of the rapid changes going on in aviation these purchases seem to me to be very questionable. Many of the machines will be out of date before they are ever used. The hearings brought out the fact that we have been appropriating money for the purchase of planes faster than the Air Corps could purchase them.

THE FEDERALIZED NATIONAL GUARD GROWS

Since the late war, the Militia Bureau has ceased to be a State organization and has become the federalized National

Guard. It is growing too. In 1920 it had 1,939 officers and 47,019 enlisted men. On June 30, 1927, there were 12,010 officers, 182 warrant officers, and 168,750 enlisted men, a total of 180,920 men. The 1929 bill carried an appropriation to take care of 188,000, of whom 13,630 were officers. The 1930 bill carried an appropriation sufficient to provide 190,000, of whom 13,966 were officers. The present bill carries an appropriation sufficient to provide for an average of 190,000 men, of whom 14,371 will be officers.

—Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was it disclosed before the committee as to whether there is to be any limit on the number that will comprise the National Guard ultimately?

Mr. COLLINS. I am getting to that. This means that this bill provides really for a larger number than 190,000 men. It will most likely be 5,000 in excess of that number. This increase is in line with the military program of the Militia Bureau, whose present objective is 210,521 National Guard troops.

The goal for this branch is 435,000, for this is the number authorized in the national defense act. They are going up step by step each year and we are going to keep it up.

The guard likewise has an abundance of horses. I do not believe they are so strong for polo as the Regular Army, but in time they will be educated up to it, too. On December 1, 1928, the guard had 10,299 horses, of which 8,389 were Government owned and 1,910 were State owned. On July 1, 1929, it had 10,322 horses, of which 8,417 were Federal owned and 1,905 State owned, and they have not purchased all of the horses for which appropriations have been made. This bill provides for the purchase of 825 more by the Federal Government. I do not know how many the States will buy. The bill for forage and bedding for these animals is more than \$1,373,430, plus more than \$1,172,250 for caretakers.

Congress appropriated \$32,619,798 in 1930 for the federalized guard. This bill carries an appropriation of \$33,058,306, or an increase of \$438,508, and to this should be added free issues of \$5,559,782 and State contributions of \$14,489,643.70. The per capita cost of the members of the federalized guard has increased from \$309.86 to \$313.53, and these figures do not include all of the items properly chargeable against the guard. The value of Federal equipment in the hands of the guard has increased from \$111,973,941.49 to \$114,624,141.87. The guard is divided into the Infantry, Cavalry, Air Corps, and other units comparable to those in the Regular Army.

The guard is an effective military organization. It has been stated that its enlisted personnel is of a higher character than the enlisted personnel of the Regular Army, and I am prepared to believe that this statement is true without a doubt.

THE ORGANIZED RESERVES A POLITICAL POWER

The Organized Reserves is the third subdivision of our military machine. This force is made up largely of civilians who hold reserve commissions in various branches of the service—Infantry, Cavalry, Artillery, and so forth. It is probably the most powerful political wing of the whole Army. The fact that these officers are in civil life, scattered throughout the country, and in the various Government departments, even in the Budget Bureau, makes them a splendid sales force for military expansion. Many of these reserve officers are reaching the age where men are inclined to add weight and lose boyish figures. They rather welcome a few weeks in a summer camp at Federal expense. And of course they are ambitious for continuous expansion.

Thousands of these officers are organized unofficially in the Reserve Officers' Association, which body becomes a very powerful political influence. Capt. Floyd Newman, of the Reserve Officers' Association, writing in the *Coast Artillery Journal* for October, 1928, has this to say about their work:

It is therefore the duty of every member of the Officers' Reserve Corps not only to belong to the Reserve Officers' Association but to broadcast the aims and purposes of the national defense act at every possible opportunity before the populace of the country individually and collectively, in order that it may be better understood, supported to a greater extent, and its enemies thwarted. * * *

Another reason why every member of the Officers' Reserve Corps should be a member of the Reserve Officers' Association is that as stated, this is the only body which Congress recognizes as having sufficient power to demand recognition by them in matters pertaining to national defense, and because only by being a member can he hope to obtain congressional legislation which will insure his being adequately trained to fulfill the office vested in him by his commission. The association has succeeded in obtaining increased appropriations and other advantageous legislation, as well as beneficial regulations, commensurate with the increase in association membership, and it will continue to gain more only in proportion to the further increase in membership.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The man who made the statement which the gentleman just quoted was speaking a bit beyond the record. The Reserve Officers' Association never has been able to get Congress to comply with its requests.

Mr. COLLINS. I think they always have.

Here is a table showing estimates and appropriations from 1926 to 1930, inclusive:

Estimate column	Organized Reserves	Appropriation column
	1926	
\$3, 222, 466	-----	\$3, 674, 800
	1927	
3, 667, 800	-----	3, 721, 300
	1928	
3, 611, 763	-----	4, 158, 641
	1929	
4, 631, 927	-----	5, 303, 583
	1930	
5, 201, 977	-----	6, 110, 602

Mr. SIMMONS. No; they always have not.

Mr. COLLINS. My experience has been otherwise.

Mr. SIMMONS. The association has been before the committee asking for certain things which have been turned down by the committee and finally turned down by the House.

Mr. COLLINS. I have never known of it.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a matter of record.

Mr. COLLINS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I do not want to get into any dispute about it. However, the gentleman is just in error. I have been on this committee for three years and every time they have come before us or before the Congress they have gotten substantially all they wanted.

On June 30, 1920, there were 68,283 officers and no enlisted men in the Organized Reserves. On June 30, 1926, 103,829 officers and 5,775 enlisted men. On June 30, 1929, there were 112,759 officers—10,831 of whom were National Guard personnel holding reserve commissions—and 5,416 enlisted men. Of these, 40,008 officers belong to noncombat units—such as veterinarians, dentists, medics, and so forth. So far as I can see, the chief excuse for their existence is their great propaganda value. The present goal for the Organized Reserves is 156,500 officers of all grades.

This bill appropriates \$6,542,362 for the reserves, and, added to this, is an unexpended balance of 1930 funds of \$500,000—making a total of \$7,042,362, while the 1930 bill provided an appropriation and unexpended balance of \$6,335,352. In other words, this bill makes an increase for the Organized Reserves of \$707,010. These funds will provide for active duty training of 14 days for 20,121 reserve officers, extended training for 586. In addition to this many other officers are given correspondence courses and lessons in so-called citizenship.

This year, as usual, the representatives of the Reserve Officers' Association appeared before our committee urging the usual increases. They are now formulating a further program of expansion which has been indorsed by this association, and we may expect to see them lining up chambers of commerce, luncheon clubs, women's clubs, and the various patriotic societies of which they are a part, to descend upon Congress next year and succeeding Congresses for bigger appropriations.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Did you give them in this bill everything they asked for?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. This year?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes. And you know, my good friend—and there is not a man in the House that I love any more than I do the gentleman from Nebraska, and usually he is an exceedingly sensible man.

Mr. SIMMONS. We can agree as far as the gentleman has gone. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLLINS. We got out of them that they had a regular volley of things that they wanted next year and they were withholding them until next year. They are going to descend upon us next year, and I do hope that the gentleman in the meantime will study this question carefully and be prepared to help defeat them.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COLLINS. No; I do not yield any further.

THE ARMY IN THE SCHOOLS

The fourth subdivision of our Military Establishment provided for in this bill is the work in schools and colleges. At the beginning of this school year there were 13,134 students taking the advanced course of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the

colleges, working for commissions in the Organized Reserves and hoping to enjoy a hearty summer vacation at camp—routed by way of the War Department budget. Seventy-three thousand three hundred and fifty-two more boys are taking the basic course in 125 of our leading colleges. There are 43,472 of these very young boys in the high schools and secondary schools of some 103 cities taking the work of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps. This makes a total enrollment of 129,958, as compared with 127,141 last year, and 97,789 in 1921. The appropriation for 1930 was \$2,667,917. This bill provides \$4,000,000 for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and additional funds for the 550 schools. However, this amount does not represent the total cost of these activities; that is probably nearer three times this figure. The increase over last year is due in part to a change in bookkeeping and in part to granting a better uniform and greater allowance for forage, and so forth. Each year this Congress meets we grant the Reserve Officers' Training Corps a bigger and better uniform allowance. This bill grants \$20 for the basic uniform and \$40 for the advanced course. The probabilities are next year we shall go still higher.

Fifteen thousand nine hundred and forty-four more boys are receiving training in 60 high schools under section 55 C of the national defense act.

One thousand seven hundred and forty-three Army officers and men are assigned to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and 27 more to the 55 C schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that particular connection?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee whether any of the Regular Army officers are assigned to instruct the boys in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are in the high schools?

Mr. COLLINS. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then here in Washington and in the high schools generally throughout the country we assign Regular Army officers to give instruction in military tactics?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I never so understood it.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; that is done.

POPULARIZING THE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Last year I told this House of some of the methods used to attract these romantic young boys into this training and to make them enthusiastic for it after they are enrolled. I told you about the use of the prettiest girls in the schools and colleges as honorary officers for these units. From press clippings I have seen since then this practice seems to be increasing. And I do not need to add that both the boys and girls seem to enjoy it immensely. In fact, it brings back the romance to military service which was so greatly damaged by the experience of that generation which saw the mud of the trenches in the World War. Here is a clipping from the Kansas City Times for April 3, 1929, that tells about their big circus, which is so beautiful I must read it to you. For sheer poetic and romantic drama it would be hard to beat. It is just a sample:

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS CIRCUS SATURDAY—SPONSOR MAJORS WILL BE PRESENTED CAPS AND CAPES—THE 1,700 STUDENTS IN TRAINING HERE WILL BE JOINED BY UNITS FROM THE OTHER CITIES IN ANNUAL EXHIBITION

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Kansas City high schools will honor its sponsor majors, representing the schools' young womanhood, at its seventh annual circus at Convention Hall Saturday night. Reserve Officers' Training Corps units of near-by schools also will participate.

Fifteen hundred strong, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps will maneuver and compete in drills. Bands will play martial music. The roll of drum and bugle will sound through the hall. Calisthenic feats will be performed.

And as a climax of the circus—in fact, of the year's work of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps—Maj. Gen. Harry A. Smith, Omaha, commanding general of the Seventh Corps Area of the United States Army, will present the sponsor majors of the high schools with caps and capes.

The girls who represent their schools as sponsor majors have been chosen in three eliminations—by the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, by the senior girls, and lastly by the faculties of the schools. They represent the highest type of student in poise, character, and academic standing in their respective schools.

The work of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps throughout the year is pointed toward the circus. It is directed by Capt. Harry E. Mitchell, United States Army, retired, in charge of the Kansas City Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The caps and capes of the sponsor majors are purchased with the proceeds.

Besides the Kansas City Reserve Officers' Training Corps there will be 200 others on the floor from Wichita University, the Kemper Military School at Booneville, the St. Joseph High School, and from Leavenworth. There will be visiting delegations of Army officers and student officers in reviewing boxes from the University of Missouri, the University of Kansas, the Kansas State Agricultural College, and the Joplin High School.

There will be three bands, Central High School, Lathrop Trade School, and Kemper Military School; bugle and drum corps from the American Legion and the Northeast High School; and the Westpoint High School orchestra. Musical drills will be a feature.

The music will start at 7.45 o'clock. The grand entry will bring the Reserve Officers' Training Corps units marching onto the floor 8 abreast until the 1,700 students are all drilling at once. There will be platoon and company drills, machine-gun demonstrations, tent pitching, and drills with rifles.

Four hundred girls from gymnasium classes will appear between the military drills with dances, tableaux, and calisthenics. The acts will be so timed that the floor will not be unoccupied more than five seconds at a time.

The American Legion, through the Heart of America Post, will present 30 medals and 11 cups to individuals and units for efficiency in specified contests. The presentation will be by Ralph B. Innis.

Ticket sales up to yesterday indicated that the hall would not accommodate all who wish to attend, according to Captain Mitchell.

I hope none of these young people ever read any of those realistic war books now current which describe what actual military service is like. It would be a shame to cast any shadow across the fun they are having.

THE GIRLS ARE ATTRACTED TO THE MILITARY

The boys in many of these places have been so delighted with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps that they have aroused the envy of the girls, who feel they are being slighted by generous Uncle Sam. So I submit the following story from the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald for November 23, 1929, to cheer up the young ladies:

THE GIRLS ARE IN THE ARMY NOW—NORTH HIGH GIRL PUPILS FORM CADET BATTALION AND WILL BE GIVEN RIFLES—ALL START AS PRIVATES IN THE RANKS—FACULTY APPROVES

A girl battalion that hopes to give the boys' battalion at North High School some keen competition, has been organized with 152 girls in the ranks.

As yet no officers have been appointed, nor do the girl cadets have uniforms, but plans are being made to provide both within the near future. It is the first girl battalion to be organized in an Omaha high school, and carries the full backing of the faculty.

The girls plan to hold regular weekly drill just as the boys do, although during this semester, until the project is a little better organized, it will be conducted without rifles. Two cadet captains, John Daum and Robert Fortune of the North Battalion, will be in command.

As yet the War Department will be unable to sponsor such a movement officially but the girls will probably be able to borrow the rifles used by the Reserve Officers' Training Corps boys and occasionally borrow their best-looking officers. After a few more years of boosting the military idea in this country the ladies may receive further consideration. In the meantime, you may as well guess they and their parents will not lead any movements to reduce military expenditures.

Gentlemen, I would like to break up this prosaic picture with a little poetry on the girls in the Army. I suggest to General Fries its adoption as a campaign song for his newly founded organization.

THE AMAZONS, OR THE PETTICOAT BRIGADE

I've traded my horse and sold my cow;
I'm through with a farmer's life, and how!
For I'm going to be a soldier now
With women in the Army.

Chorus

Oh, it's fun to be a soldier, boys,
And with the women stand
In uniform at drill, boys,
And hold each other's hand.

I've placed my books on the dusty shelf;
I'll study no more to "improve myself"—
For I've no desire for fame or pelf,
With women in the Army.

I've discounted goods and closed my store,
And a "For Sale" sign is on the door—
For I'll not need to work any more
With women in the Army.

The fire has gone out in the boiler room,
And business is under the seal of doom—
For there isn't a girl to tend a loom
With women in the Army.

The banker weeps o'er his pile of gold,
And factories crumble 'neath moss and mold—
For there's nothing more to be bought and sold
With women in the Army.

The grass is growing all over the street,
And aged men are all you'll meet—
For the young men are gone with flying feet
With women in the Army.

A soldier's hardships now will cease;
The colonel has promised complete release,
And each shall have at least one apiece—
But what'll it do to the Army!

MUCH OF THE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS POOR PREPAREDNESS

What is the purpose of having all these little boys playing around with Army men? Does it really make the country any safer? The fact that in 1929 only 6,226 of the total Reserve Officers' Training Corps enrollment of 147,402 received commissions and only 5,790 graduates went into the Organized Reserves shows that the War Department is wasting money on boys who are too young for serious military work. Those in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and in the 55 C schools are entirely too young for worth-while military instruction. This should be done away with entirely.

Eighty-two of the two hundred and eighteen college Reserve Officers' Training Corps units in the country are in the technical branches, such as engineering, air corps, veterinary, and so forth. Many of these colleges and students look upon this work as just so much free technical instruction paid for by the Federal Government. I do not feel War Department funds should be used in this way. Let the college supply their own facilities and pay for their technical courses, as they would if there were no Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

The War Department pays advanced students \$85.50 per year while attending college, plus a \$40 uniform, plus a summer at camp for about half of them, with all expenses paid, and 70 cents per day cash in addition. And still less than 5 per cent of the underclassmen go ahead and secure commissions. Much of the time and money spent on the remaining number might be saved without impairing national security one bit. These other students get very little preparedness—mostly propaganda.

In their anxiety to attract all these young men the Army has discontinued bayonet work and many other unpleasant features of the training. Every effort is made to attract the boy to join for what he can get out of it personally—free uniforms, rifles to shoot, horses, military circuses, and so forth.

SCHOOL BOARDS SEEK FEDERAL FUNDS

When the school board of Kansas City heard that a military economy program might reduce their high school Reserve Officers' Training Corps they requested their chamber of commerce to use whatever political influence possible to save the appropriation. A clipping from the Kansas City Times for September 7, 1929, partly explains why the school board was opposed to such military reduction:

WOULD ADD TO EXPENSE

The loss of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps would add considerably to the expense of the school district. In the three upper classes of the schools here participation in the corps is considered gymnasium credit for graduation. To abolish the units would require an additional five or six physical training instructors, costing salaries annually from \$10,000 upward. * * * The Reserve Officers' Training Corps makes it possible for many to attend school by furnishing a uniform that is worn in place of civilian clothing. Captain Mitchell, the officer in charge of the unit, said. * * * "The total expenses of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps' member are considerably less than for a student in gymnasium work. Gymnasium shoes and suit do not have to be purchased, and we give a thorough physical training."

THE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS CAUSES SCHOOLS TO OPPOSE PRESIDENT HOOVER'S REDUCTION PROGRAM

There is a very grave warning of the political dangers of these civilian training agencies in the fact that in a number of cities where there are now Reserve Officers' Training Corps units the press reports that the school board, or the chamber of commerce, or both, have petitioned their Congressmen, or the War Department, or the President to maintain those units regardless of whether the Economy Commission thought them valuable. Members of this House should pause to consider what this means. Is America reaching the stage where any suggestion

of reducing the military budget is going to bring down on our heads a swarm of petitions to go ahead pouring out the gold that makes these military units shine?

Shall we encourage the local institutions and individuals to want bigger and better military budgets by responding to the requests of this ever-growing military machine? Think what it means to have our public schools opposing the peace program of President Hoover if that program cuts their Reserve Officers' Training Corps units. The question that confronts us and the President is whether we shall remain free as public servants to provide a sensible military budget or be shackled by a powerful military organization continually demanding more—driven and coerced.

THE ARMY TURNS SCHOOLMASTER

What do they teach these boys in these civilian training units? I have asked this question again and again. If they should put them through the hard grind of training necessary for the serious business of war, you can be sure the work would not be so popular and there would not be so much enthusiasm for it. So they have to find other reasons to justify the expenditures. The Kansas City Times for September 7, 1929, quotes Capt. H. E. Mitchell, in charge of their high-school Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as saying:

Militarism is secondary: We have direct orders to act in a manner to build character rather than to emphasize military instruction. We teach a respect for all religions and instruct the boys to respect the religions of others. * * * We teach courtesy and a respect for the law. The training forms habits of decision and precision and makes for self-discipline.

Other officers say that they teach them to be "clean young men," which means, as a member of this subcommittee seems to think, to brush their teeth, to take warm baths, to salute their officers, to march spryly in a parade, and to believe in a bigger and bigger Military Establishment. Of course, this would be funny if it were not serious. How has it come about that these United States should turn to the Army for school-teachers and wet nurses? At a time when the world is trying to rely less and less on military measures and to strengthen more and more our peace machinery it is sheer folly to place men in uniform in leadership of school boys and girls.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLLINS. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Government pays the cost of the uniforms of those who serve in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the student who receives the uniform has any obligation to the Government.

Mr. COLLINS. Only to take this training.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. When the uniform is given to the student, does the student own that uniform?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed one hour. Without objection, the gentleman will be allowed to continue his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. If the gentleman from Oklahoma will let me run along, I think I will cover the point he has in mind.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I was just trying to find out how far that uniform passes from the Government to the student.

Mr. COLLINS. It is given to him.

EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES DENY VALUE OF MILITARY DRILL

Our best educational authorities are overwhelmingly of the opinion that military drill is inferior education and has no place in the school system. During the war our National Education Association appointed a commission to study this question thoroughly. It published a lengthy report, which says in part:

Military education makes a strong appeal to many citizens because of the influence which, in their opinion, it exerts upon the physical bearing and the mental attitude of its recipients. This is especially true in times when the prospect of war is remote or nonexistent, when there seems to be no need for the soldier * * *.

It is often claimed that military exercises, whether we call them military training or military drill, offer the best method of training pupils in obedience, promptness, truthfulness, industry, and other desirable personal traits, in short, of developing personal character, and of training pupils physically. Those engaged in the work of education are practically unanimous in asserting that these claims have no justification.

The ideals of the kind of obedience and of general conduct aimed at by military exercises are best represented by the word "martinet," which

these exercises long ago contributed to our educational vocabulary—ideals which every teacher who aims at real character development seems to avoid.

Those who favor military drill maintain that it is the most effective means of developing patriotic feeling * * *. But, if we look beneath the surface, we find that military patriotism may be no deeper and no more lasting than military obedience * * *.

What, then, is the place of military education or military training of American youth? We should like to say that there is no place in this age of advanced education, which recognizes the supremacy of humanitarian ideals, which recognizes the mutual dependence of the nations of the earth and of their peoples upon each other, which recognizes the brotherhood, that enlightened nations can acknowledge as such * * *. If, therefore, we can not realize peaceful ideals, if it is necessary for us to resort to force, we are compelled to say, as we have said, that the obligation of military preparation should be borne by those who are capable of it, and that the age of those should not be less than 19.

STATE COMMISSIONS CONDEMN DRILL

During the war and since that time the States, New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, have appointed official commissions to study the value of drill in their high schools. All three advised against it, New York doing so after having tried a state-wide system.

GEN. ROBERT E. LEE CONDEMN'S MILITARY DISCIPLINE

I believe earnest students of the educational value of military training will be interested in the following extract from Personal Reminiscences, Anecdotes, and Letters of Gen. Robert E. Lee, written by J. William Jones, published by D. Appleton & Co., of New York, in 1874, by authority of the Lee family and of the faculty of Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, page 93:

Those who were acquainted with Gen. Robert E. Lee only through the incidents of his public career may have expected that he would have framed the discipline of the college over which he presided in accordance with the system at West Point, in which he was educated and of which he was for some years the superintendent, and in accordance with the order and practice to which as a military man he had been so long accustomed.

His explanation of the reasons for not adopting a discipline so familiar to him and that would have been so easily administered in his hands was that he did not propose to train men for the Army but for the pursuits of civil life, and that in his view the discipline fitted to make soldiers was not best suited to qualify young men for the duties of the citizen.

ROOSEVELT ADVISED HIS SON AGAINST MILITARY

You may be equally surprised at the following extract from a letter from Theodore Roosevelt to his son Ted, written at the White House January 21, 1904, and published in Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children, Scribners, New York, 1919, page 83:

If you have definitely made up your mind that you have an overmastering desire to be in the Army or Navy * * * I have little to say. But I am not satisfied that this is really your feeling. It seems to me more as if you did not feel drawn in any other direction * * * and that you are therefore inclined to turn to the Navy or Army chiefly because you would then have a definite and settled career in life and could hope to go on steadily without any risk. Now, if such is your thought, I shall quote to you what Captain Mahan said of his son when asked why he did not send him to West Point or Annapolis:

"I have too much confidence in him to make me feel that it is desirable for him to enter either branch of the service."

I have great confidence in you. I believe you have the ability, and above all, the energy, the perseverance, and the common sense to win out in civil life * * *.

About going to West Point and leaving the Army * * * except for the profession of an engineer, you would have nothing like special training and you would be so ordered about and arranged for that you would have less independence of character than you could gain from them. You would have had fewer temptations but you would have had less chance to develop the qualities which overcome temptations and show that a man has initiative.

You ought not to enter unless you feel genuinely drawn to the life as a life work. * * * I should say yes to some boys, but not to you. I believe in you too much and have too much confidence in you.

In view of this evidence against the educational values of military training in the schools, we can not escape the conclusion that it is now supported by local authorities largely because Uncle Sam pays the bill, or to glorify the military. By such a policy we are teaching these boys to think of citizenship and military service in terms of getting something out of the Government.

COMPULSORY MILITARY DRILL IN AMERICA

One of the boasts of the average American is that we do not have compulsory military training in the United States, but this is not true. Military training is compulsory in 159 colleges, universities, and other schools. Military training is elective in only 69 institutions. In the 55 C schools, I have no definite information, but it is my guess that it is compulsory in many of them, too, perhaps most of them.

Mr. McSWAIN. Will the gentleman yield? It is compulsory in a sense that if he goes to that school he is expected to take the course prescribed?

Mr. COLLINS. Take a young man who wants to go to the Agricultural and Mechanical College of my State where military training is compulsory. He can go perhaps for a less amount than he can to any other school in the State. If he has not sufficient money to go elsewhere he must go to the Agricultural and Mechanical College where military instruction is compulsory.

If a boy wants to study agriculture he must go to a land-grant college, which means in practice that agricultural students are compelled to take military training to get their education. The same thing is true of engineering students in most sections of the country.

Mr. McSWAIN. I want to ask the gentleman a question: Is that institution a State institution of Mississippi?

Mr. COLLINS. In answer to the gentleman from South Carolina, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi is a State institution. It is also a Federal institution, in that it is a land-grant college, and as such must give military training.

Mr. SPEAKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKS. By what authority?

Mr. COLLINS. Section 40 of the national defense act.

COLLEGE POLO POPULAR

A picture of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps would be incomplete without some credit being given to their advancement of polo. The college boys are patriotically rallying to this sport, too. It is part of the citizenship training that teaches them to sacrifice for their country. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps had 1,773 horses at the opening of this school year and bought 103 in November and December. They expect to spend \$16,500 to purchase 100 more in 1931. The forage item alone amounts to \$197,529. More can be spent if necessary. The press contains many accounts of growing polo teams. Here are two samples:

Albany (N. Y.) Times-Union, December 11, 1929:

"Polo on a comprehensive scale is in prospect at Cornell, because of the wide interest in horsemanship.

"Twenty-five hundred students have been given instruction during the last 10 years and, according to Col. Joseph W. Beacham, commandant of the Cornell Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the school has become 'horse conscious.'"

New York Evening World, February 25, 1929:

"CORVALLIS, OREG., February 26.—Polo, called the most expensive American sport and calculated to cost \$10,000 for each individual per season, in reality is inexpensive as a college sport.

"Figures compiled at the Oregon State College disclose that the total outlay for a team at those schools where the Government maintains Cavalry Reserve Officers' Training Corps need not average more than \$150 per season. It makes polo decidedly less costly than the run of minor sports at a college.

"At Oregon State the only expense is for transportation and that is paid from receipts earned at the games. There is no expense for a coach, as the Army furnishes a man who has regular duties in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in addition to the coaching.

"The Oregon State mallet swingers are allotted two ponies, Regular Army horses, which are used in riding classes. Their original cost would not average \$166. They are cared for by enlisted soldiers, so there is no additional expense for grooming. The saddles and harness are Regular Army issue. So the polo club mallets are about the only expense.

"* * * Using these Army horses, Oregon State last year was able to tie Stanford for Pacific coast honors."

And the lady majors and colonels fall strongly for this, too.

I am very happy to add before leaving this subject that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps has been able to secure one more mule. Last year they had 13, which was apt to be a dangerous or unlucky number of mules.

SKATING AND TOBOGGANING NEXT?

I wish also to commend an innovation in civilian training reported from the cold North. I read from the Houghton (Mich.) Gazette for December 8, 1929:

SNOWSHOES FOR STUDENTS

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps intends to supplant some of their drill periods this winter with instructions in the proper use of

snowshoes. This is not an Army requirement, but Captain Ball feels that every engineer should feel at home upon a pair of snowshoes and that this is just as good a time to learn as any.

Steady yourselves, my colleagues, for a drive next year for snowshoes. Horses, bands, pretty girls, snowshoes—our civilian military training is indeed ingenious and resourceful!

THE CITIZENS' MILITARY TRAINING CAMPS

This is another agency which lends itself gloriously to advertising the military and to winning the support of the public for an increasing military budget. Last year 37,976 boys took part in the free summer camps. This item in the bill for 1931 carries \$2,814,772, an increase of \$72,164 over the amount in the 1930 bill. The citizens' military training camp is the inspiration for some of those beautiful posters we see in the street cars and in other public places advising young men to call upon their generous Uncle Sam. This committee was advised that over \$100,000 of the amount appropriated was to help pay the expense of posters and other methods of informing young men that vacations are free for asking, and, for that matter, if those charged with the responsibility of expending these funds see fit, the program of advertising can be enlarged, because this is a lump-sum appropriation and a larger sum can be expended in procuring summer campers. If the camps are free and there are more applicants than can possibly be accepted, we might as well ask whether so much advertising is necessary. But it probably helps to make just so many more boys want to go to camp—which in turn is just so much more excuse for bigger appropriations.

TEACHING MILITARY CITIZENSHIP

The publicity which these summer camps get has so much to say about teaching the boys to be good citizens and says so little about the serious business of fighting, we may well ask what they mean by good citizenship.

Now, "good citizenship" is a broad term and is apt to mean different things to different people. To the preacher good citizenship is apt to mean a correct attitude toward God and things godly; to the lawyer it is apt to mean obeying the law; to the storekeeper it may suggest paying one's bills. No one should be surprised if the soldier thinks of good citizenship in terms of enthusiastic support for the military program and the Military Establishment.

The War Department has published an official Manual on Citizenship Training (T. M. No. 2000-25) for the use of officers teaching young men in the citizens' military training camps, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and so forth, which bears out this suspicion very well. It sings the praises of military training, saying:

Business invariably gives preference to the young man who has had training in military leadership. Many industries provide their employees with 30 days' vacation on pay for the purpose of attendance at a summer training camp, knowing that they will return to their employment better equipped, better disciplined, and in every way much more valuable to themselves and their employers.

It takes a slap at those who do not continually boost for a bigger and still bigger Army by referring to their attitude as "destructive idealism." I quote:

The attempt to undermine the Nation from within is more serious than the threat of armed force from without.

An impractical and destructive idealism called internationalism is being propagated by certain foreign agitators and is being echoed and reechoed by many of the Nation's "intellectuals." Its efforts are to combat the spirit of patriotism, to destroy that spirit of nationalism without which no people can long endure. * * *

I take it President Hoover and Prime Minister MacDonald had not read this or they would not have made the dangerous internationalistic pronouncement quoted from earlier in this speech. By this standard the words of Jesus Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God," sound like the rankest Bolshevism.

MILITARY MANUAL CRITICIZES DEMOCRACY

I am disturbed by a recurring note in this official manual on "citizenship," where the General Staff seems so concerned about what they call "enemies within" the country. They come dangerously near suggesting that a class war is inevitable by continually harping on the dangers of what they call "collectivist" activities. One wonders if they are trying to strike at such old American organizations as trade-unions and such. This fear is deepened by their definition of democracy, which I quote:

Democracy: A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of "direct" expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic—negating prop-

erty rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

Why should the General Staff of our Army so characterize democracy? This is a sample of citizenship that our military men are teaching our boys. Does it look toward progress or toward militarism? Will it not aggravate the very communism it is meant to check?

TUTORS ON THE BASIS OF 1 TO 3

One thousand one hundred and eight Regular Army officers, 22 warrant officers, 7,070 enlisted men, and 2,989 reserve officers, a total of 11,189, were assigned to caring for these 37,976 young men who went to camp last summer. I suppose the large number of Army men is used because some of the boys are quite young and might get homesick or fall off their horses unless watched; and then, we must find jobs for our soldiers. The more jobs we can find for them, the more soldiers the Army can ask this Congress to support.

The future program calls for the training of 100,000 of these boys.

THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE

The sixth division of our military expenditures is the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. Yearly teams from all branches of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the civilian military organizations, along with police teams and teams from civilian rifle clubs, both men and women, white and colored, gather, and for three weeks are engaged in target practice. They are furnished with guns and ammunition and all other essentials necessary for camp life—all at the expense of the Government.

One thousand six hundred civilian rifle clubs enrolling over 110,000 civilians, represent the total strength of this organization. Last year this committee was told that about 30 more schools below the grade of 55 C are given military training with the aid of this board out of Government funds, and receive bayonets, belts, scabbards, rifles, ammunition, and cleaning equipment. About 1,500 boys are in training in these schools.

For the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice this bill carries \$738,870, an increase of \$22,240 over the bill for 1930. This by no means covers the total cost, however. And, of course, these people have a wide-awake organization that is asking for more and more funds. Colonel Coward testified before our committee that they had a long waiting list of civilian rifle clubs that had signified their willingness to accept free Government supplies whenever they could be secured.

PROCUREMENT PLANNING SUPPLANTS MUNITION UNIT

Under an act of June 8, 1926, Congress authorized the creation of another division in the Army called the munitions unit. This subcommittee, however, in the 1929 bill saw fit to prevent its beginning, and has successfully eliminated any appropriation for this purpose in both the 1930 and 1931 bills. The purpose of this unit was to take young men after graduation from college and give them three months' training in the Regular Army, then send them to college for nine months, and after this to put them in the factories of the country for six months, giving in all 18 months specialized training in factory work and management.

In the event of hostilities these men would become officers and would take charge of the factories of the country and operate them under the supervision of the Regular Army. It was proposed to begin with 250 such students and later to bring them up to 400 and thence to a larger figure. The law says that one-half of 1 per cent of the enlisted strength of the Army and 2 per cent of officers can be trained annually. With our Regular Army Establishment at its present size this would provide approximately 840 students to be trained annually, and with the retirement figure at 64 years it would be possible to have about 34,500 such officers. Of course, this figure is the outstanding one and should be reduced by one-half on account of deaths, resignations, and other causes, but even with 17,250 such officers its size and expense would be enormous.

This scheme has never been tried out. No country has it now or has undertaken it. The students trained may or may not follow the work for which they are trained. If they do not, the training is wasted. If they do the work for which they are trained, it is foolish to let them contract with themselves in the purchase of supplies for the Government or to permit them to adopt work standards, with the War Department backing them in every whim. Aside from this, it is a dangerous undertaking in a Republic to put its factories, including management and men, under the control of the Military Establishment.

I do not wish it understood, however, that the War Department is not already now engaged in this particular work or activity, for they are. It is called "procurement planning." An

Assistant Secretary of War is directly in charge of it and 98 full-time officers, 48 part-time officers, and 132 civilians are assigned to this meddling into industry and other fields of endeavor. In addition to these the War Department has appointed quite a number of influential civilians who might be termed "dollar-a-year men." They are appointed because of their outstanding influence and ability in industry and commerce and to lend color and respectability to the work, so that the general public will be lulled into the belief that it is of some importance. This committee, realizing that expansion of this monkey business is dangerous, provided in this bill that the number of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees shall not be greater than the largest number employed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929.

The idea back of the provision in the national defense act and the later act creating this work is to turn over to the Army the operation and management of fields, industry, and transportation in the event of war or an emergency. Of course, it follows that the Army feels that it is better prepared to operate and manage them than the civilians who now own and operate them, and, therefore, that it is all for the best interests of the rest of us. With this idea I do not agree. I still believe that the civilians who are responsible for making our transportation systems the best that exist and our factories and industries large and powerful are capable at all times of properly managing and operating them. I still believe their patriotic impulses in time of war can be relied upon and that they can be depended upon to respond to the fullest limits. Furthermore, I seriously doubt if the average Army officer, whose business training is limited, could effectively perform duties and responsibilities about which they know nothing. Furthermore, I believe that this playing around would end finally in a wholesale breakdown of both industry and commerce. I also seriously doubt if this experiment would be in the interest of the owners of industry and transportation or that Army management would be of help to the employees of industry and transportation companies. As to agriculture, I hardly think that the lot or the general welfare of the farmer would be improved or that the general condition of agriculture would be benefited. The truth is Army officers are wholly ignorant of this character of work. They know nothing about it and they have had no training which fits them to do it, and the scheme is a wild-eyed one, that would result in incompetence and gross mismanagement. In addition it is a dangerous undertaking for a republic to venture into.

PROCUREMENT "PLAYING"—NOT PLANNING

Several times I have called the attention of this House to the dangers of this idea of procurement planning. I call it procurement "playing" because it gives such a beautiful opportunity for a number of Army men and civilians to feel the big thrill of having their fingers upon the whole machinery of the land. They can make charts and plans and draw up dummy contracts and orders and set up beautiful schemes for regimenting the whole country for the fatal day. They are still hoping and working to achieve their crowning peace-time triumph, the passage of "educational orders" by this Congress. I have brought this matter up here because we must be on our guard against their growing plans and demands.

THE GIGANTIC MILITARY MACHINE

Gentlemen, I am not trying to be facetious in my picture of our Military Establishment. The situation is too serious for that. I am simply trying to show you that we are maintaining a much larger Army than the public realizes. Look at the total for which we are providing: Regular Army, at least 205,177; National Guard, at least 192,000; Organized Reserve, deducting National Guard men holding reserve commissions, 107,344; Reserve Officers' Training Corps, 147,402—this includes 55 C schools with 15,944 and schools below 55 C with at least 1,500—citizens' military training camp, 37,976; making a grand total of 689,899. If the rifle teams enrolling 110,000 are added, which I have not done, we get a grand total of about 800,000 people, as a minimum, taking toll from this bill. A formidable number, is it not?

PROPAGANDA POWER OF THE ARMY

I am convinced this House and the people of the country have not stopped to consider the great political power of this machine. Not only are about 800,000 people directly concerned but the system reaches out in to every city, town, and village in the country. I have tried to find out the total number of Army posts, Army offices, area headquarters, city-school systems, colleges, camps, and so forth where military officers are on duty and having opportunities to reach the public through speeches, personal contacts, and so forth.

I find, for example, that the Regular Army has at least 340 posts, arsenals, fields, offices, and so forth, outside Washington and 38 procurement planning offices. The National Guard has

3,203 camps, units, and offices. Military training receives Federal aid in 418 colleges and preparatory schools, and these boys go to 44 camps under 9 corps area officers. The citizens' military training camps have 89 procurement offices and camps. The National Board of Promotion of Rifle Practice has 1,600 clubs. The Organized Reserves have 88 offices in 87 cities. There are many duplications in this list, but the total of 5,829 is very suggestive of just how much propaganda power might be used.

Then, you must remember that these official activities have their unofficial associations backing them up in all their undertakings. The citizens' military training camps have the Citizens' Military Training Camps Association with 3,400 active workers over the country. The Organized Reserves have the Reserve Officers' Association with local chapters in all leading centers. The National Rifle Association backs up the National Board. And now a Reserve Officers' Training Corps Association has been formed to promote the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in schools and colleges. The poor old public will be bombarded with heavy propaganda artillery and this Congress will be helpless unless we stop this growth now.

HERE IS THEIR GOAL

Last year I told this House of the ambitions of the military arm as they were outlined by Col. P. S. Bond, who has helped prepare most of the textbooks the Army uses for these boys in the colleges. I quoted from his book *Our Military Policy*, which outlined among other things these objectives for a "modest" military force:

A Regular Army of about 300,000 enlisted men and 20,000 officers. A National Guard under complete Federal control numbering from 400,000 to 500,000 officers and men. An Organized Reserves of from 500,000 to 1,000,000 officers and men. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps in schools and colleges. Universal military training for young men in time of peace. Compulsory service, both military and industrial, in time of war. A proper equipment for all troops and a proper reserve of equipment and all necessary supplies, etc.

This military man's program for our Government was rehearsed before our hearings on the Organized Reserves, this time by Maj. Raymond E. Lee, of the War Department General Staff, and is as follows:

The first military objective of the War Department for the national defense is, of course, the general mobilization plan, 1928, which is, in turn, based upon the intent of Congress expressed in the national defense act. This plan governs all our projects for man power, munitions, and plant for any considerable emergency.

The personnel called for amounts to a total of 254,767 officers and 4,301,947 enlisted men, an effort 20 per cent greater than the one made between April 6, 1917, and November 1, 1918, which resulted in the mobilization of 214,723 officers and 3,643,000 enlisted men.

This is the field Army plan. The most important difference is a reduction in the time involved from 19 to 10 months. We believe this is possible on account of several factors which did not obtain in 1917, namely:

1. A carefully elaborated plan for mobilization.
2. Decentralized regional machinery for its execution.
3. A more highly trained staff to supervise its execution.
4. A more highly educated personnel to act as commanders and instructors.
5. A war reserve of material to use at the outset of mobilization.
6. A plan for industrial mobilization to supplement the war reserve.
7. A larger and more highly trained National Guard.
8. The existence of an Officers' Reserve Corps, a considerable part of which is organized into military units, properly distributed geographically, and in tactical units.

And note, gentlemen of the House, that Major Lee stated we are striving for and on our way to the objective; and further that the plan as outlined by him is our "first military objective."

SHOULD THE ARMY HOLD THE PURSE STRINGS?

I do not wish to be too hard on the military men responsible for maintaining this great machine. They naturally take pride in it and want to see it increase. But it is time to call a halt. This House must realize that we must set a limit to this military outlay. The War Department must find ways to reduce this budget. Every year it continues to grow, the political power and the tradition back of it grows stronger.

Where is the enemy against whom we are to send these airplanes, these shot and shell, these gases, these charging polo ponies, these mobilized factories, and the growing ranks of soldiers? Who can say our national security would be imperiled by a reduction of many of the items in this bill? As laymen, we may not be able to outline in detail all the exact points of reduction, but we can say to the General Staff certain objects must cease and this total expenditure must be reduced. It will be supreme folly for this country to continue to lead the world up the path of growing military expenditures. At the

very moment our delegates are on their way to London to urge other nations to reduce naval expenditures the Congress is voting larger appropriations for our military machine. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the arrangement has been made with my Republican colleagues that no time was required except the members of the Military Committee. Does the gentleman from Mississippi have any objection to their yielding me 10 minutes at this time?

Mr. COLLINS. No.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have such high respect for my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] that I listened with much interest to what he has had to say regarding this bill, and in many places, frankly, with considerable sympathy. However, he quoted from the statement of an officer of the Reserve Officers' Association, which purported to claim that the Reserve Officers' Association is the only organization that could tell Congress what to do and have that done. I rise at this time solely with the purpose of correcting the Record, because I do not believe their claim is true.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLINS. If I have made any statement that is not in line with the facts, I shall correct it later.

Mr. SIMMONS. We all know that the gentleman would not intentionally make a misstatement of fact. I want to use that claim of the Reserve Officers' Association as a basis of what I have to say. My recollection is that some three years ago when our late colleague, Mr. Madden, was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and likewise when our former colleague, Mr. Anthony, chairman of this subcommittee, the Reserve Officers' Association conducted a campaign to put through Congress and to fasten on the War Department appropriation bill a series of items, running into millions of dollars, some of which to my mind were absolutely unjustified, some of them bordering upon what I considered to be absurd, some of them merited; but without regard to the merits of those items—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Just let me finish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to follow this closely. I did not get the place from which the items came that the gentleman considered absurd.

Mr. SIMMONS. From the Reserve Officers' Association some three years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That called for appropriations?

Mr. SIMMONS. For increased appropriations. I mean absurd when you consider the entire military set-up. But without regard to the merits of that, every Member of Congress received telegrams from the reserve organizations within his State and district. I did, the chairman of the committee did, the chairman of the subcommittee did—we were all bombarded with telegrams requesting support of their items.

The net result of it was that one item of the several that the Reserve Officers' Association asked for was in part put into the bill on the House floor in the Committee of the Whole, but when the time came for a record vote on that item it was voted out, and those in favor of the reserve officers' program could not muster enough votes on this floor to get a roll call. That is the record as I remember it during the consideration of the last bill that Mr. Anthony handled. Since then, as far as I have known, there has been no particular campaign upon the part of the Reserve Officers' Association to dictate to Congress, and probably the organization has increased in respect in this body as a result of that change of policy.

In the friendly colloquy I had with my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], I asked him if this year the Reserve Officers' Association had gotten everything from Congress that they asked for in this bill. His answer was yes. In the hearings on page 1082, Colonel Harriman is quoted as testifying that there should not be less than 25,000 reserve officers trained annually. The record on page 1084 following shows that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] was present at the committee that morning and interrogated the witness. I am advised that this committee did not give the Reserve Officers' Association the 25,000 men they asked for, but less than 21,000 reserve officers to be trained. That is the particular item about which the controversy has been carried on on a number of occasions on the floor of the House. My recollection is that there has never been a time when Congress has given appropriations to train the number of officers requested by the Reserve Officers' Association, and I am not criticizing the Congress for that, because I think it is right.

Then, again, on page 1083 the Reserve Officers' Association have asked for the transfer of certain expense items to the reserve officers' appropriation. I am told that has not been granted. Then, again, they ask for certain charges of the National Guard to be transferred to another appropriation, and that was not allowed by the committee. Then on page 1084 they asked that certain provisions regarding sick pay should be made retroactive for five years. I am told that that was not granted. Then, again, on 1084 they have protested against 4 cents a mile mileage for reserve officers when reporting for training and insisted on the regular mileage of 7 cents a mile, which is allowed to Regular Army officers in active service. That request was not granted. Then, again, on page 1090 the representative of the Reserve Officers' Association says this to the committee:

We realize that we can not get everything we ask for.

So I think the record is clear that the Reserve Officers' Association does not dominate the committee which handles this bill or the House of Representatives.

I resigned my commission as a reserve officer in 1923 before I took my oath as a Member of this body, so that I am not speaking as a reserve officer or a member of that association. The gentleman from Mississippi objects to the training given in the schools and colleges to boys in this country in the rudiments of military drill. I am one of the men who went into the Army during the World War without having any previous military experience. I was placed in charge, within a few months, of men, where we were responsible not only for their food and keep but for their well-being 24 hours a day. Men ought not to be placed in positions of responsibility like that without previous training and experience. [Applause.]

We ought not to put in charge of men who go into war officers who had no previous knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of an officer prior to their entry into the war.

Lack of adequate training and preparation took an awful toll of lives and money during the World War. We are now paying millions to dependents of men who died, and other millions to men broken in body or mind as a result of their service. Much of this suffering could have been avoided and cost saved had America's men been better acquainted with the fundamentals of military training.

As I see it, the reserve is an integral part of our national-defense policy and plan. If it is to be abolished, it ought to be done by direct act of Congress and not by denying proper appropriations. I do not favor its abolishment. In my judgment Congress has been liberal with the Organized Reserves, but that is a liberality based on its judgment as to what is needed and not a liberality forced on Congress by the Reserve Officers' Association or any other group.

I have two boys. God grant that the time will not come when either of them will be called upon to enter the armed service of their country in time of war. But if that time does come, I want those two boys of mine to know how to take care of themselves. [Applause.] I would be remiss in my duty as a parent if I did not see to it that they knew something of the rudiments of military drill and military science in order that they might not only care for themselves but that they might also help care for those who are with them, and thus better serve their country. Just as it is essential that we teach our citizenship to know and meet the responsibilities and duties of peace times, so it is necessary that they likewise know and be able to meet the responsibilities and duties of citizenship in time of war. There is nothing wrong nor harmful in what we call the school of a soldier or the work incident to acquiring the rudiments of military drill, the ability to stand erect, the ability to take care of oneself physically, the training in the simple fundamental rules of physical care, the discipline and the coordination of action, all of which comes in the training of men. Then there comes the time when men stand at attention and salute America's flag and pledge themselves anew to America and America's ideals. There is nothing wrong in teaching an American boy that, and there is nothing wrong in letting him have that thrill that comes when he is wearing the American uniform. There is much of good in all of it. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the high points in this bill have already been pretty fully covered, or the most of them have, in the general debate which has preceded. There is just one item in the bill to which I wish to direct the attention of the committee. It is a matter which for some years here on the floor of the House, when mentioned, has caused a general twitter of laughter all over the House. Even when the last message from the President of the

United States was read from that desk and this subject was mentioned the House on both sides broke out in hearty laughter. From these remarks I imagine you already know the subject I am going to discuss.

The bill carries this item:

For operating, maintaining, and keeping in repair the works at Dam No. 2, Tennessee River, including the hydroelectrical development, \$260,000, to remain available until June 30, 1931, and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

That has reference to the old, old subject of Muscle Shoals, Ala. Now, gentlemen, in all seriousness I want to call the attention of the members of this committee to some facts and figures with reference to what is taking place and has taken place in the last fiscal year at Muscle Shoals, Ala. I have prepared a table which shows the Government figures for power sold at the Wilson Dam for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929.

In July, 1928, they sold 2,836,000 kilowatt-hours, whereas during that month there was available at this plant 159,960,000 kilowatt-hours.

During the month of July, 1928, only 1.7 per cent of the available power at this plant was actually sold by the Government.

I will insert in the Record the figures for each of the months for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929. I will not take time now to read them, but my table shows the actual power sold each month, the available power each month, the price received, and the grand total for that year shows there was only sold 90,954,000 kilowatt-hours, whereas there was 1,727,530,000 available kilowatt-hours, and that the average percentage of the power sold for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, was only 5.3 per cent; and, further, that this power was sold for the insignificant sum of approximately 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, when, as a matter of fact, the same power was distributed throughout the country at from 5, 6, 10, and 12 cents per kilowatt-hour.

The total revenue received by the Government from the sale of this power for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, was \$181,481.88, while the operating expense which the Government paid during the same period for operation and maintenance was \$217,116.59.

Gentlemen, I am giving you these figures to show what an inexcusable, unjustifiable, shocking waste is taking place at Muscle Shoals, Ala.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the committee any estimate as to the potential demand for the surplus water power at Muscle Shoals, so far as hydro power is concerned?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, sir; I can not go into the details about that; but I know the Congress has an offer before it to pay 4 per cent interest on the cost of the power plant less the pre-war expenditure on the Wilson Dam.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit further, my thought is to try to get the gentleman's knowledge of the local situation as to whether there will be any potential demand from the municipalities and the instrumentalities connected with the municipalities for this surplus power.

Mr. WRIGHT. Why, certainly; it will all be absorbed if the plant should be disposed of under a proper lease.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why is it not being sold then at present?

Mr. WRIGHT. For the simple reason that the Alabama Power Co. is the only company which owns a transmission line to Muscle Shoals, Ala., and has a monopoly in securing the contract from the Government for the purchase of this power.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is it necessary for the Government then to do in the way of further equipment to make this power available?

Mr. WRIGHT. To lease the property at a good rental and let the lessee utilize and distribute the power.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is with respect to leasing the power; but if the Government wants to sell it what would be necessary, in spite of the opposition of the Alabama Power Trust.

Mr. WRIGHT. It would have to install transmission lines.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know how long, but it would have to be many miles in order to create a market for all of this power.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Is it not true that under the contract now, at least, the Alabama Power Co. only generates and pays for the power they now have a market for, and if they have not a market, they let the other go uncontrolled and do not generate the power?

Mr. WRIGHT. Under what is termed a temporary lease, entered into by the Chief of Engineers of the Army or the Secretary of War with the Alabama Power Co., that company is only obligated to take just so much of this power as it may want, and the result is that from July, 1928, to June, 1929, it only took on an average 5.3 per cent of the available power at this plant.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is due to the fact that the War Department is unable to enter into any long-time contract with the Alabama Power Co.

Mr. WRIGHT. That element has much to do with controlling the prices because it is a temporary contract.

Mr. BARBOUR. Because Congress may act at any time and the War Department can not tie the plant up and have that contract interfered with by an act of Congress.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no doubt that is a potential factor in the low rate at which the Alabama Power Co. receives the power; but that is the condition, gentlemen, to which I am calling your attention and is a condition that ought to be corrected.

In addition to losing the value of this power that might be utilized and sold, I call your attention to the fact that the Government has invested in this power plant alone, to say nothing of the nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, the sum of \$46,864,404.03. I do not know where they got the 3 cents, but I suppose it entered into the cost of construction.

In addition to the loss that the Government is sustaining by reason of failing to utilize and sell this power, the Government is also losing interest on this huge investment of over \$46,000,000. If you will simply take 3 per cent of that and add it to the figures to which I have called your attention, you will find the Government is annually sustaining a loss at the hydroelectric power plant at Muscle Shoals alone of three and a half or four million dollars.

Gentlemen, is this good business? Is it good sense? With all due deference and kindness to my colleagues, I want to pause here to ask you if we are impotent. We have been struggling with this question about 10 years. Can we not dispose of it? Are we not business men? Have we not heads on our shoulders? This waste is appalling. It has almost reached the point of a national scandal, gentlemen. Let us dispose of Muscle Shoals at this session of Congress.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not know much about Muscle Shoals. I have heard a great deal, however. What is the real obstruction to the sale or the disposition of a large amount of this energy? Is it lack of market or is there some obstacle that the gentleman has in mind that might be removed by legislation or administration?

Mr. WRIGHT. My friend, I presume maybe you have heard or read that there is a combination in the United States known as the Water-power Trust?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; it has been so rumored where I was.

Mr. WRIGHT. I imagine the gentleman has heard perhaps a far distant rumor or rumbling that such a thing existed. That is the answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. SLOAN. That is a retort, but not a complete answer.

Mr. WRIGHT. You can analyze that.

Mr. SLOAN. I was astonished when the gentleman stated the amount that had been sold, and I concluded if all the energy had been conserved in the talk about it it would far exceed the amount of energy emanating from this other institution. [Laughter.]

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to say that all that group of States down there are clamoring for some disposition to be made of this power, and in addition they want other dams on the river to supply the industries of that country with hydroelectric power and also for use in the operation of the great nitrate plant.

Mr. SLOAN. One other question—if you can not sell the power can you not sell the dam site?

Mr. WRIGHT. All you have to do is to take the bridle off and every kilowatt will be absorbed. They are clamoring for this power, and they want additional power—they want other dams built and if they are they will absorb the whole of it.

There has been adopted a superpower—that is, they relay the power. In other words, the power generated at Muscle Shoals, if it were needed at Washington, would be sent first to some station not far distant and they would use it there and then power generated there would be sent to another station, and so on, so that finally when it was used in Washington it would come from some near-by point.

Now, in addition to but including the hydroelectric and steam plants, you have an investment there of approximately \$130,000,000. The balance of the investment is in that great cyana-

mide nitrate plant which the farmers of this country believe can be put at work and utilized for the production of concentrated fertilizer which can be produced at a great saving to the agricultural interests of the country—perhaps 50 per cent less.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Why do you not do that?

Mr. WRIGHT. Why do they not do what?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Well, I will put it this way: Why is not that done? This valuable property was instituted for the purpose of selling fertilizer at cost. I have been hearing it for the last 10 or 12 years. What is the real difficulty about it?

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to exonerate the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. I have served on that committee for 10 years. That committee early in the consideration of the matter reported what was known as the Ford offer—to lease it to Henry Ford—and we passed the bill through the House. Mr. Ford saw that the Senate was not going to pass it and so he withdrew his offer.

As a last resort last year we reported a Government operation bill, which policy did not accord with my views, because I do not believe in the Government going into business in competition with citizens. In my desperation to make some disposition of Muscle Shoals and try to stop the waste to which I have called attention, I supported the bill as best I could. It was passed by the Congress and received a pocket veto by President Coolidge. Then at the last session the Committee on Military Affairs reported favorably what was known as the Madden bill, a bill to lease the property to the American Cyanamid Co. or to its subsidiary and the lease to be guaranteed by the Cyanamid Co. We did what we could to get that up.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. But the real reason that we did not get the Government operation bill through was because the gentleman from South Carolina had a steam roller which took the fertilizer clause out of the bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. O Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to my friend that the gentleman from South Carolina had no steam roller in operation at all. It was merely an amendment that I offered which I think was in line with the spirit of the national defense act, because when this bill was passed in 1918 this property was dedicated under the terms of that act—

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from South Carolina to exonerate himself if he can, but to do it quickly.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Oh, let the gentleman from South Carolina finish his sentence.

Mr. McMILLAN. Under the terms of that act this plant was dedicated to the manufacture of nitrogen for war purposes in time of war and to agricultural purposes in time of peace. My amendment was in direct line, as I saw it, with the terms of that act—to manufacture nitrates in time of peace for agricultural purposes. If my victory last year is to be termed a steam roller, that is my explanation, and I have no apologies to offer.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to say further in explanation of my genial and able friend's explanation that it so happens that he is a splendid representative of his people, and he happens to live in a congressional district in South Carolina where there are more fertilizer plants to the square inch than in any other part of the United States. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Is it not a fact that one of the real obstacles in the way of carrying out the policy of the national defense act in time of peace is due to the opposition of the Alabama Power Co. and the Fertilizer Trust?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, my friend has hit the nail on the head. I was going to get to that. The reason we have not been able to get any legislation through the Congress about Muscle Shoals is because of these two organizations, one known as the Water Power Trust and the other as the Fertilizer Trust. I am not hostile to either the Fertilizer Trust or to the development of hydroelectric power. I would rather encourage them. I hold no brief for either of them, and I am by no means hostile to them, and I do not censure either of them for taking care of their interests, but here is the sole reason why we have not been able to legislate: First, because this Power Trust has generally been opposed to the bills which have been reported and which have been considered by the committee. Second, because the fertilizer interests realize that if this property is leased under a bill which is now pending in Congress to the American Cyanamid Co. that company is a real live, going concern, and is right now engaged in the very business it proposes to engage in at Muscle Shoals, which

is the production of concentrated commercial fertilizer, which instead of containing 15 per cent plant food will contain from 45 to 60 per cent plant food, and be sold to farmers at 8 per cent profit on the cost of manufacture. The fact is that the fertilizer plants in my State of Georgia and in my friend McMILLAN'S State of South Carolina are not equipped to produce this concentrated fertilizer, and, therefore, they oppose this legislation.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the commendation which the gentleman from Georgia has made of me in my representation of the district that I represent; but let me say this for my friend's information, that when these amendments of mine were offered and adopted last year I voted for the passage of this bill when it was before the House to be sent to the Senate.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes; and after it was emasculated by the gentleman's amendment, and after that gallery up there was literally filled with fertilizer men from all parts of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rather sympathize with these fertilizer interests, because they are not up to date; but what happens in this country with the wheel of progress constantly revolving? As I have said here before, the old stage coach gave way to the locomotive, and then followed the automobile, which practically put all of the buggy, carriage, and wagon concerns in this country out of business. It is one of those inevitable things. We must yield to progress, to these modern economic conditions, and that is all there is in it. If you will keep the fertilizer interest out of this Congress for a while, and the hydroelectric power interests out of this Congress for a while—and I do not mean they should not be represented as any other business is properly represented—if you stop their activity which they have been indulging in for all these years, we will soon pass a bill which will make a satisfactory disposition of Muscle Shoals, Ala. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Has the gentleman not introduced and has now pending before the committee a bill similar to the one introduced by Mr. Madden, the bill generally known as the Madden bill, for the lease of this plant to the American Cyanamid Co.?

Mr. WRIGHT. The American Cyanamid Co.; quite right; but being a modest man I did not want to mention that. The bill speaks for itself, and I believe if enacted would be the best and wisest disposition of Muscle Shoals yet proposed.

A great quantity of the power would be absorbed in the manufacture of a highly concentrated commercial fertilizer and the balance in useful channels. I will not at this time, however, go into an analysis of the bill.

The table to which I referred as well as some other facts and figures follow:

The Government figures for power sold from the Wilson Dam power station for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, are as follows:

	Power sold (kilowatt- hours)	Power avail- able (kilowatt- hours)	Per cent sold
1928			
July.....	2,836,000	159,960,000	1.7
August.....	14,399,000	152,241,000	9.0
September.....	7,291,000	146,417,000	5.0
October.....	8,409,000	136,625,000	6.1
November.....	7,445,000	129,455,000	5.7
December.....	14,966,000	139,801,000	10.7
1929			
January.....	20,535,000	144,198,000	14.0
February.....	2,835,000	140,859,000	2.0
March.....	3,081,000	130,175,000	2.3
April.....	3,046,000	150,652,000	2.0
May.....	3,067,000	144,902,000	2.1
June.....	3,044,000	152,245,000	2.0
Total for fiscal year 1928-29.....	90,954,000	1,727,530,000	5.3

The revenue received by the Government for this fiscal year amounted to \$181,481.88 for the 5.3 per cent of the power sold, and the operation and maintenance at Wilson Dam for the fiscal year amounted to \$217,116.59.

To equal the amount of \$260,000 for operation and maintenance at Wilson Dam in the new appropriation bill would require the sale of about 7 per cent of the available power, whereas in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, only 5.3 per cent was sold.

During the month of December, 1929, the Government sold at Wilson Dam power to the amount of 5,415,000 kilowatt-hours, or 3.4 per cent of the 158,977,100 kilowatt-hours estimated available.

At 2 mills the revenue from this power would amount to \$10,830 for the month of December, 1929.

To equal the appropriation in the War Department appropriation bill just reported to the House of \$260,000 for the operation of the power plant at Muscle Shoals, or Wilson Dam, would require the sale of 132,500,000 kilowatt-hours of power at 2 mills, or about 7 per cent of the average available power.

On the basis of the revenue for the month of December, 1929, such an average income throughout the year would be only about half enough to equal the mere appropriations by the Government for operation of the power station.

If one-half of the available power during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, had been sold at Wilson Dam instead of the mere 5.3 per cent actually sold, the Government would have received a revenue of \$1,750,000 instead of \$181,000 and odd actually received.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I do not want to be understood as taking general issue with the address made by my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], because I agree with him in some of his strictures of conditions as they are, and because I have personally offered as many criticisms, not only on the floor but in the more effective and more appropriate place, the Committee on Military Affairs, of the policy and measures and methods of the War Department, particularly as it conducts the Regular Army, as any Member of the House or of the committee. But the particular point in his able address to which I injected an effort to bring objection and criticism was the suggestion that there are more than 100 colleges in the United States where there is compulsory military training, and by implication that compulsory training is the result of some policy of the War Department or of some law of Congress.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, there is no school or college in the United States where there is compulsory military training in the sense in which that word is ordinarily employed. Of course, if a young man wants to go and get an appointment to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point he has got to take military training. That is as much a part of the curriculum as mathematics, and also if a young man obtains an appointment to the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The military training there is part of the system of the instruction. But so far as these schools and colleges in the several States are concerned, if they have compulsory military training in their courses it is the result of State action or State legislation.

Take, for example, the land-grant colleges to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] refers. They include the agricultural colleges and colleges of mechanic arts, and in all of the States those colleges are annually deriving large sums of money from the land grant acts of Congress. If a young man attending any of those schools is compelled to take military training, it is because of the fact that the State which accepts this grant provides that training. The purpose in providing a military course for those colleges who receive grants under the land grant act is to decentralize those students from the personnel of the Regular Army. For that reason it was desired that this course of instruction should be vested in State authority, and that such instruction should be diffused throughout the country to enable the students to be soldiers in case of need and thus to constitute a civilian army. That was the purpose. So that in a proper sense there is no compulsory military training in any of our State schools.

Mr. COLLINS. They are required to impart that instruction under the direction of the War Department, and they can not get the money without giving the military instruction.

Mr. McSWAIN. If the Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College wants to get money for its schools it has to provide military training for those schools, but there is no requirement that obliges the institution to take a dollar at the hands of the Federal Government. If there is military training there, it is the result of the action of the State of Mississippi, just as in South Carolina it is the result of the action of the State of South Carolina.

Mr. COLLINS. Before the gentleman puts that down in black and white I suggest that he read the land grant law.

Mr. McSWAIN. I may be mistaken as to what the land grant act provides. I do not know how it is in Mississippi, but in South Carolina and other States they have military schools supported 100 per cent out of the State treasury. The State of South Carolina for practically 100 years has had an academy at Charleston called "the Citadel" where young men are trained in the art of war, so in case war should come, to help our common country, and the expenses are paid out of the funds of the taxpayers of South Carolina only. The people of South Carolina make no apology for the reasonable and sensible and proper preparation of young men in the military art. It is a wise and rea-

sonable expenditure of public funds. The people of South Carolina have believed in it from the beginning, and they believe in it at this time.

In the district that I have the honor to represent there are two colleges which are state-wide institutions for two great religious denominations of the State; one of them of the Methodist denomination, and the other of the Presbyterian denomination; and at each of these schools there is a Reserve Officers' Training Corps. One of those schools was established 75 years ago for the training, primarily, of young men for the ministry.

It has also trained lawyers and business men by the hundreds and thousands, and now under the opportunities offered by the national defense act and the liberality of Congress, it offers instruction in the military art. I do not want to interfere in any way with the military instruction that is offered to the citizenry of the Nation. We are still a free people, and we can always, I submit, be a free people so long as the power of appropriation and law making rests in the hands of a majority of the people of this Nation. We have no reason to fear that some particular coterie whose members live out of the Federal Treasury can determine our policies or dominate our ideas. They are all of our own folks and they eat their bread out of our hands, and the moment the Nation disapproves of it we have the right to cut off their supply, and we will do it.

Now, so far as the reserve officers are concerned, I commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] for his statement when he said he resigned his commission as a reserve officer when he was elected to Congress. I commend him because I did the same thing two years before he had done it, and I did it because I think in the Constitution of the United States there is an incompatibility between exercising the responsibility that accompanies a reserve officer's commission and the duties and functions of a Member of Congress. The reserve officers are always subject to the call of the President. If I were a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps now and the President called me, which of these two obligations would I obey? Would it be the power of this House to arrest me and to compel me to attend its sessions, or the power of the President to send a squad of soldiers after me and compel me to perform my military duty? I resigned my commission for that reason. I think it is wise that there should be no cross currents here.

But these gentlemen who constitute the Reserve Officers' Corps are citizens of the United States, and they are discharging a patriotic duty, and they are discharging it at their own expense, and largely in the spare time permitted to them aside from the performance of their business and professional duties. [Applause.]

I now repeat what I have often said, that in my humble judgment we obtain a higher percentage of net result in the form of proper preparedness for some inevitable emergency, far removed to the distant future, I earnestly hope, out of the money that we appropriate for the assistance, encouragement, and instruction, of the Reserve Officers' Corps, than from any other form of military activity. It is complained by some that we are appropriating \$7,000,000 for the next fiscal year for the Organized Reserves. Yet it is admitted that there are over 100,000 such reserve officers who are keeping in constant touch with military progress by conferences, by correspondence courses, by reading magazines, and by conversation between such reserve officers, as they come in frequent contact in the several communities. The older members of these Organized Reserves are men that saw service during the World War, and some of them during the Spanish-American War also, and they are men that know their rights and their duties as soldiers. These reserve officers are annually recruited from the graduates of the best military schools and land-grant colleges of the country. Our States and Nation have invested many millions of dollars in the military training of these young men in these military schools, and the most sensible and reasonable thing is to conserve and to continue that military training by encouraging these young men to take commissions as reserve officers and to carry on their studies and to continue their training.

If there be any that would destroy this corps of Organized Reserves, and if such would destroy military training in any of the schools and colleges of the Nation, then I remind them that they are rendering the civilian population of the Nation a serious disservice, by leaving the entire control and management of our military machine in the hands of professional soldiers and lifetime officers, who would have the management and control of our raw and untrained civilians in time of war. Surely no man would say that we should abolish the National Guard, the Regular Army, and the Organized Reserves. But serious attacks have frequently been made on the Organized

Reserves, which seem to imply that some would repeal the law if they could, and would cut off all appropriations if they could, and thus cut up the Organized Reserves, root and branch. It would be a serious mistake from the point of view of the civilian soldier and the taxpayer and the national defense. These reserve officers can only have patriotic motives for their efforts. Even the National Guard, whom we have not heard attacked, and which I strongly indorse and approve as an indispensable factor in our program of defense, is now paid for weekly drills and for encampment service. Yet, we have heard, several times in the past, as well as recently, the Organized Reserves seriously charged with being but propaganda agencies for the Regular Army, and their annual training periods criticized as summer vacations at Federal expense. If those who have made these criticisms would undergo the 30-day training period themselves they might not regard it as a mere frolic. But they forget that the Regular Army is on the pay roll 12 months in the year. They forget that these reserve officers attend conferences, study books and magazines, and answer questionnaires, and pay out of their own pockets the expenses of their associations and meetings and for all this receive not one cent of money from either the State or the Nation. Those that attend the summer camps are paid and should be paid, and the \$7,000,000 thus expended yields a higher dividend in the net result of more than 100,000 officers prepared to organize and equip and train and transport and feed and house an army, than any other money we spend for defense.

Let me enlarge upon the suggestion already made that the reserve officers are most essential for the proper training and fighting of the civilian army upon which our Nation must rely in time of war. Of course, I do not know when and where war will break. I can not tell who and where the enemy is. And if I am ever able to point to and to name the enemy, it will be then too late to make the preparation to fight it. I do not know when the fire will burn any of my houses; but I do know it will be too late to take out insurance when the house is on fire.

Now, these reserve officers not only know their military duties but they know their rights; and knowing, dare maintain; and in time of war they can hold their hands and match their wit and defend their rights with, against, and from the Regular Army officers. These reserve officers understand the civilian mind and heart, and when the raw civilian troops are mustered from field and factory and mine and store and office these reserve officers can better handle them and obtain co-operation from them, and get results by so handling than Regular Army officers. Furthermore, business and professional men, bankers, merchants, lawyers, and manufacturers holding commissions as reserve officers are better qualified to cooperate with the business interests of the Nation and to mobilize the industrial, financial, economic, and transportation resources of the Nation than the Regular Army officer. So, if I had my way, I would encourage more of the graduates of our military schools to join the Organized Reserves, and thus take from our backs a part of the expense that we now bear for the continuous, all-the-year-round pay of many Regular Army officers. The more good reserve officers the fewer Regular Army officers. The fewer professional Regular Army officers we have the less danger of militarism, and the less desire of war merely for glory and chance of promotion.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take a great while this evening, because I believe it is about time we began to read this bill, but I do want to present to you a little fuller picture of the Air Corps and its activities and its comparative activities than has been the opportunity of any preceding speaker to present to the committee.

The 5-year program for the building up of our Air Corps in the Army and for building up the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Navy was entered into and became effective on the 1st of July, 1926. Since that time Congress has continually appropriated large sums of money to carry out the aims of those acts. It has not always provided all the funds that were asked in the estimates or in the programs which were gotten out by the interested corps at the time the bill was passed, but it has provided all the funds that could be efficiently and economically used and expended during all of that period, so that it has gradually and steadily built up those forces, until now we have in this country, or will have by the time the moneys that are carried in this bill are expended, about 1,670 airplanes in the Army, and we will be practically up to the requirements of the Army program.

We will have upward of 800 planes in the Navy, and the two together will make the largest air force of a military character in the world. Not only that but we will have trained and developed at that time over 2,000 pilots—I think 1,350 in the Army and about 800 in the Navy—making a little over 2,100 pilots well trained and well qualified to operate planes.

The moneys have really been appropriated faster than they could be efficiently used, having in mind the state of the craft in this country. I think at the present time we will not complete the deliveries upon the 1929 money until some time in the fiscal year 1931; we will not complete the deliveries, probably, of the 1930 program, until some time in the year 1932, and when we will exactly complete deliveries upon the 1931 program can not be told at the present time.

There is another factor that we want to bear in mind. The development of aircraft factories has gone on at such a rapid pace that at the present time the aircraft factories for the first time are beginning to look for business. That has resulted in this situation, that the Army is able to get better prices on the planes—that is, lower prices—they are able to get the factories to bid lower and to furnish more planes for the moneys that have been appropriated. I believe that before they get through with their 1930 money they will buy from 30 to 40 more planes, of just as good quality, than they told us they would be able to buy at the time we made the appropriation. I believe that the 1930 money will provide instead of 383 planes, as the estimates called for, somewhere around 420. I would not be surprised if they went further, and if at the close of 1931 the entire shortage which it has been alleged exists was entirely wiped out.

There is another factor with reference to this aircraft situation which I think is of a great deal of interest. Improvements are going on so rapidly in connection with this art that almost before planes come out of the factory they begin to be obsolescent. I do not mean that they are not sound; I do not mean that they are not safe; but I mean that the rate of progress in this industry is so great that it is absolutely impossible to build planes on a larger scale than we are building them at the present time and do it efficiently.

I think it might almost be said that the entire appropriation for both Army and Navy planes should be fairly considered in the nature of experimental work because of the fact that these planes are improved upon so rapidly. However, there is an absolute necessity that this country keep pace to the fullest possible extent with the world in this art. The Army maintains an experimental aircraft outfit at Dayton and the Navy at Philadelphia. Those institutions have separate appropriations. I believe that no money we spend upon the air force is better spent than that which calls for intensive development and a large amount of competitive Government work in developing this art.

There is another thing which I wish to call to the attention of the committee, and it is a very important thing from the standpoint of the way we treat our fliers. The factor of safety which the Army and Navy require in the construction of airplanes is 12, that is, that everything which goes into an airplane which enters either service is supposed to be 12 times as strong as it is necessary for any individual piece to be in order to stand the strain which is ordinarily put upon it.

That compares with a factor of safety of eight in England, France, and most of the other foreign countries; it compares with a factor of safety as low as five, which is maintained by a great many of the civilian aircraft corporations. Of course, this factor of safety of 12 gives a greater range of mobility on the part of our planes. It enables our pursuit and attack planes especially to go through maneuvers which are absolutely impossible with planes of lesser factors of safety. It enables them to take full advantage of their speed and full advantage of their diving ability. It enables them to take full advantage of their ability to rise quickly in the air, which I think is something necessary in connection with a pursuit plane or an attack plane.

I wanted to make this statement as to the condition of our Air Corps because I believe the country itself should know that we are dealing exceedingly liberally with this arm of our national defense. It should be liberally dealt with but not extravagantly. I believe we are going just as fast and just as far as we ought to go at the present time in making our appropriations. At the same time I do not want Members of Congress to feel we are shirking our duty and that we are not holding up our own to the fullest.

I wish to call the committee's attention to one other thing. I am not the least bit disturbed at the danger to our form of government from our components of the Army. I admire and I honor those men whose spirit of patriotism inspires them to serve in our National Guard and our Officers' Reserve Corps.

I think it is a fine thing that we are able to train our young men in the citizens' military training camps. As a result of an investigation, which I believe was started by our committee, the Reserve Officers' Corps is at the present time developing real efficiency. The cream of its membership are the young men who are going into it from the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in the colleges at the rate of from 5,000 to 7,000 a year.

These men are equipped for real service and are performing real service in laying out a moderate equipment for this country in case of an emergency. We are not going further than we should with it; at the same time we are probably spending at this time just about what we ought to spend.

We do not allow them to dictate our appropriations nor are we in any way prejudiced against them. We just treat them fairly.

I want to call the attention of the House to one other thing and that is the procurement planning proposition.

This is being carried on in a moderate way under the Assistant Secretary of War. It is not a scheme to place Army officers at the head of factories. Nobody ever thought of such a thing. Congress never thought of such a thing, and it is not provided in the national defense act. It is simply a program by means of which executive officers in the War Department with business training can find out and know in what factories they could place orders either for munitions of war or for other war supplies in case of an emergency. It is not a scheme by which the Government would take over the management of the factories over the heads of trained factory managers, but simply that they might know where they can promptly and efficiently place orders and procure prompt execution of these orders and thus avoid the tremendous delay which took place at the time this country went into the Great War in 1917.

It is a constructive measure and not a foolish one. It is true that it must be held down. It is true that it must not be allowed to run wild and result in foolish expenditure of money, but within reason and within common sense it is an activity which in case of emergency would be found of real value to the Government.

I have been pleased to have this opportunity of presenting these two matters—

Mr. COYLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. The gentleman spoke of approximately 2,000 trained pilots, 800 in the Navy and some 1,300 in the Army.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COYLE. They are men qualified within this 5-year period?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. COYLE. And that, in addition, of course, to the ones qualified prior to that period?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; that would include those who are in the Army and in the Navy who are qualified pilots. I do not mean that that is the 5-year objective, but the 5-year objective is not complete.

Mr. COYLE. I understand.

Mr. TABER. There would be a little more than 2,000 at the end of 1931, and it would be nearly up to the objective for the end of 1931.

Mr. COYLE. I understand, and thank the gentleman.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. When the gentleman was talking about the factor of safety, the gentleman was referring to the structural factor of safety?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. As distinguished from the margin of safety?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further general debate, the Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Secretary of War, \$269,247: *Provided*, That no field service appropriation shall be available for personal services in the War Department except as may be expressly authorized herein.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I notice the committee has made quite a change in this paragraph in extending the limitation so as to include "no field service appropriation," extending it from the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, as in existing law, to the War Department in general. The query that comes up in my mind is whether there may not be some ill effects arising in the administration of the War Department if you are going to have this provision in as extensive form as is proposed in the bill.

The provision carries the phraseology "except as may be expressly authorized herein." I have followed the bill and I do not find any provision anywhere in the bill that especially authorizes the employment of any men in the enlisted force. I can conceive of some warrant officers or noncommissioned officers who, on reaching the retirement age, might wish to do service here in the War Department in some administrative capacity instead of being retired at a very high salary. Where is the argument, I will ask the chairman of the subcommittee, that prompted the subcommittee to extend this limitation to the War Department in toto?

Mr. BARBOUR. We have carried it in the bill heretofore. We formerly had it in two places in the bill, one related to the office of the Assistant Secretary of War, and in the other place—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman indicate where it is found in the existing law?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is under "Pay of the Army."

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the phraseology?

Mr. BARBOUR. "No clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department."

Instead of having this in two places in the bill as it has been, it was combined and applied to the whole War Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this a recommendation of the War Department?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this phraseology carried in the Budget?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is a consolidation of the language that came up in the Budget.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the language carried in the paragraph under discussion recommended by the Budget Office?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; the language I have just read is recommended.

Mr. STAFFORD. I mean the language that the committee reports.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is simply a combination of two items in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is more than a combination.

Mr. BARBOUR. Wait until I get through. There was one provision applying to the office of the Assistant Secretary of War and in another place we had this other provision which I have just read that related to the rest of the War Department. So instead of having it in two places in the bill we have put it in one place and made it applicable to the War Department which is in effect the same as it was before.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it coextensive? Will the gentleman read the provision found in another part which I thought related only to the Chief of Staff?

Mr. BARBOUR (reading):

No clerk, messenger, or laborer at headquarters of tactical divisions, military departments, brigades, service schools, and office of the Chief of Staff, shall be assigned to duty in any bureau of the War Department.

Over in another place there is a similar provision relating to the office of the Assistant Secretary of War. They were combined in this so as to cover all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to be technical, but it struck me that the proviso might bear a construction that would forbid the employment of any officer, or the payment of a salary to any officer, for service in the department proper.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is what we want as to this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. We must have some officers paid out of these funds.

Mr. BARBOUR. They are not paid out of the field service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, if the gentleman does not think that it is doing violence to the service, all right. My purpose was to direct the attention of the committee to the change. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Judge Advocate General, \$113,509: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$34,849 may be used for the employment of such experts, at rates of pay to be fixed by the Secretary of War, and other employees as may be required by the Judge Advocate General of the Army for the preparation of evidence for use in behalf of the Government in claims or suits filed in Federal courts on account of alleged patent infringements and other causes and for like services in connection with other patent matters and other causes and for necessary per diem and traveling expenses in connection therewith, as authorized by law.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order in order to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. Do I understand that the Judge Advocate's office deals with infringement of patents?

Mr. BARBOUR. They do where the question relates to a military matter.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does not the Department of Justice cooperate with them?

Mr. BARBOUR. It does.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

In expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 661-673, U. S. C., Supp. III, title 5, sec. 673), with the exception of the Assistant Secretaries of War the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended, and in grades in which only one position is allocated the salary of such position shall not exceed the average of the compensation rates for the grade, except that in unusually meritorious cases of one position in a grade advances may be made to rates higher than the average of the compensation rates of the grade but not more often than once in any fiscal year and then only to the next higher rate: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the classification act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. My purpose is to get some information as to the reason why the committee placed in this paragraph the exception of the Assistant Secretaries of War. I do not believe that is carried in existing law. You make an exception of the Assistant Secretaries of War. Other than that it is existing language as I read the bill.

Mr. BARBOUR. The salary of one Assistant Secretary is fixed by law at \$10,000; the other is under the operation of the classification act. This provision has been carried in the bill for some time.

Mr. STAFFORD. My attention has not been called to it.

Mr. BARBOUR. Practically all of the appropriation bills have carried the same provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have before me the existing law, and I do not find in the existing law the phrase that is carried in lines 5 and 6 on page 4—

With the exception of the Assistant Secretaries of War.

My query is to ascertain the reason why the committee made that exception.

Mr. BARBOUR. The reason for it is this: One of the Secretaries is paid by a fixed salary of \$10,000 and the other one is under the operation of the general classification act. This Assistant Secretary is in grade 15 with a salary range between \$8,000 and \$9,000. He receives the maximum of that grade, or \$9,000. The exception is made in order to remove his position, like other Assistant Secretaries in the departments, from the operation of the provision which prohibits pay of employees from exceeding the average of their grade. It only applies to one Assistant Secretary of War.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is his salary under the classification act?

Mr. BARBOUR. Nine thousand dollars.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then this is for the purpose of raising his salary \$1,000 up to \$10,000, to the same level as the other assistant?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is to provide a salary of \$9,000. There was a proposal made by the Budget to raise his salary \$1,000. That was stricken out by the committee, because it is a matter that is controlled by law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am having difficulty in following the gentleman. If the purpose of this new clause is to allow the salary of the other Assistant Secretary of War to be raised \$1,000, then that is the purpose of it.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; we are not raising his salary \$1,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the purpose of it? He is either going to get an increase or he is not. I have no objection to having the salary of the Assistant Secretary raised \$1,000, but the gentleman says that they did not grant the Budget request, and yet here it seems that you are going to grant the request.

Mr. BARBOUR. The purpose of it is this: One of the Assistant Secretaries of War comes under the classification act, and this, as I understand it, is to permit him to receive the maximum salary of his grade, which is the salary he is receiving now.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is to boost the salary of the Assistant Secretary of War from \$9,000 to \$10,000?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. Because that can not be done under the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. In your report you say you deny the Budget request to increase it, but with this language you raise it to \$10,000. It is tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. JAMES. On page 5 of the report it says that the suggested increase has been denied.

Mr. STAFFORD. I just said that the report says it did not comply with the Budget request, yet you have language here in the bill that grants the Secretary of War power to increase it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain it. One Assistant Secretary of War is entitled to \$10,000 by virtue of a special statute. The other Assistant Secretary is under the classification act. Under that classification act he is entitled to only \$9,000. The Budget recommended that he be increased to \$10,000, but the way the Appropriations Committee viewed the law, it was impossible under the law for him to receive more than \$9,000, and so we refused to allow it. This provision is in the bill so that the Assistant Secretary of War whose salary is fixed by the classification act shall not be bound by the limitation which we have here imposed, which prevents an employee receiving a salary above the average of the grade.

Mr. STAFFORD. So in a few words this new language enables the Assistant Secretary of War to have his salary raised from \$9,000 to \$10,000.

Mr. TABER. It does not. It enables it to stay at \$9,000, which is the maximum under the classification act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the salary can not be increased any higher?

Mr. TABER. Not beyond \$9,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, after the very informing and elucidating explanation made by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, WAR DEPARTMENT

For purchase of professional and scientific books, law books, including their exchange; books of reference, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, maps; typewriting and adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, linoleum, filing equipment, photo supplies, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor trucks and motor cycles, and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; street-car fares, not exceeding \$750; postage to Postal Union countries; and other absolutely necessary expenses, including travelling expenses, \$100,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Military Establishment, which subcommittee has presented this bill, what, if any, legislation is in this appropriation bill?

Mr. BARBOUR. There is absolutely none in here. The gentleman means new legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Absolutely none, so far as this committee is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Positively none?

Mr. BARBOUR. So far as this committee is concerned there is none. We have used every effort to keep new legislation from this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I congratulate the committee. When the gentleman says "so far as this committee is concerned," does he mean the subcommittee of the grand committee or the grand committee of 35?

Mr. BARBOUR. The subcommittee and the whole committee. I do not know what the gentleman means by the "grand committee."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. BARBOUR. I would like to hear about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It must be apparent to those who study the ways of legislative bodies that year by year the House of Representatives of 435 Members is, under the Budget system, being divided into what I might term—without disrespect, if you please—an "A" class and a "B" class. There are 35 Members in the A class, and sometimes it looks as if all of the rest of us are in the B class. If new legislation

is permitted to be added by the Committee on Appropriations, then it is certain that the nonappropriating committees will become weaker. I shall explain further if I have time. For the present I am content to ask the chairman if there is new legislation in this very important bill. He replies that there is none—absolutely none.

Now, my colleagues, please understand that I am not criticizing the committee, or this subcommittee, or any subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. But I do criticize the misapplication of the Budget system. I feel sure that the rules under which that system was adopted are not being followed. I agree that sometimes it is necessary to enact legislation on an appropriation bill. If the House of Representatives does not do it, the Senate will do it, and then after conference this body gives in. We can make rules for this body—not the other legislative body. If you doubt what I say, keep your eye on this important bill when it comes back to the House six weeks or two months from now. And in the meantime, notice how many authorization bills from the Military Affairs and other important committees are returned from the Bureau of the Budget without the bureau's approval.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the Appropriations Committee works hard, and I know that they are trying hard not to usurp the duties of what has been designated the B class, the other 400 Members who have seats in this body. But in the eight or nine years since we have had the Budget system and the committee of 35—the grand committee, I call it—I have seen an inch taken here and an ell there, session after session, so that in a half dozen years all of the legislative items put into the appropriation bills amount to enough legislative acts to comprise a considerable book of statutes if printed all together.

If not stricken from the bill by a point of order, which it seldom is, the item is carried one year, the next year, and then another year, and thus it becomes just as good a law as if it were brought from a legislative committee.

Is not that what is happening? Take this very bill that is appropriating for the Army. I did not get time to complete my remarks made awhile ago, but can not anyone see that the size of the Army is regulated by the amount appropriated for food for that Army? It almost amounts to about that. Authorizations from the Military Affairs Committee? Why, of course so; and bills from the Military Affairs Committee will not pass unless after hearings and analysis the majority of the members of that committee analyze them. In fact, a bill may be rejected if the committee asks for a Budget opinion on it. So, with the question of the size of the Army, the food of the Army, the housing of the Army. Of course, there is law for these things—old law.

But the Budget acts ahead of any chance for a legislative committee to authorize; that is to say, the Budget has one year's jump on the Military Affairs Committee at its authorization bills, speaking generally, of course. And the Appropriations Committee itself acts after the Bureau of the Budget and endeavors to "undercut" the Budget estimates. Commendable! Why, of course. But the departments and their various bureaus have already trimmed their own estimates to the bone. See how it works. An agent, let us say, of the Interior Department at some far-distant Federal station is asked to send in his estimates of needs for the approaching year. He is warned to cut them very close, and he does so. Then his chief here in Washington takes a whack at them. Then the Secretary of the Interior takes another cut at them and sends them to the Budget, and that bureau sends the estimates—which are already about naked—back with a request for a 10 per cent cut. Everybody is afraid of the Budget, and the horizontal cut and the park superintendent, who has to meet the public and be good natured about it, loses his estimate by which he hoped to have one more window and one more clerk to issue admission tickets for pay.

This has actually happened at Yellowstone Park. And the harassed agents there and Government people everywhere apologetically tell the public that they can not do better until Congress appropriates more money.

Gentlemen, where is the sinking fund that belongs to the Government's business? Where are the increased appropriations for the ever-increasing population of an ever-centralizing Government? The Budget has laid down your limit. It works after Congress adjourns. I make bold to say that Congress never intended, when Congress established the Budget system, that the great activities of the Federal Government and all its departments should shrivel and wither, that its everyday agents should be overworked and underpaid.

Go to these outlying stations and see the need of actual physical improvements here and there. Notice where outside and far away from the District of Columbia the Government needs paint. Its houses need paint. Its clerks need living wages and time in which to do an ever-increasing business.

I think there is a great misunderstanding as to just what are the duties of the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget can be balanced without pinching the tail feathers clear off of the eagle. It is the duty of the 435 Members of the House and the 96 Members of the Senate to see that the Budget system is operated as Congress intended it to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the subcommittee appreciates the castigation that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has given us. But so far as the importance of our work is concerned, I would term it trivial. We have actually changed only 14 money items in this bill, and before it is passed by the House the total changes, so far as money is concerned, will aggregate only \$368,000. In other words, about all this subcommittee has done since the 15th of November has been to familiarize ourselves with the handiwork of somebody else.

Now, I hate to make that sort of a statement. I hate to think that the Congress of the United States is more or less a rubber stamp for certain departments of the Government, but certainly this has been the case in this bill. Of course, we have changed the phraseology in a few places, but these have not been many. The sum total of our work has been mainly the familiarization of ourselves with the handiwork of somebody else.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Certainly.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not the fault of somebody else. Our committee is appointed by the majority of the House, and they can take out or decrease every item in this bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; of course.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand from the gentleman's remarks that in the bill as reported there are only 14 items that are not as reported by the Budget in phraseology?

Mr. COLLINS. The 14 merely increase or decrease money items.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Are they the only changes in the language of the appropriation bill?

Mr. COLLINS. I will say to the gentleman, in order to relieve his mind on that point, that this committee has been very punctilious in keeping out legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is what they all say.

Mr. COLLINS. I am truthful in my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I know; but right here on the last page—and this is a very frank report, above the average—are limitations in the provisions, and the limitations are indicated, and there are three or four items in italics, so that when we read down to page 36 of the bill we need not worry any more.

Mr. COLLINS. But I repeat, this committee has been very punctilious in keeping out legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know exactly what the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has in mind, but I think the RECORD ought to show what the facts are with respect to this highly important bill, covering so many pages. The report sets out the situation, and in the report only one of the items is legislation at all. All these other changes are mere limitations. The one that has a legislative character does not amend any existing statute but simply takes \$10,000 out of the operation of the statute with reference to advertising. I thought there was something the gentleman from Washington wanted in the Interior Department bill appropriated that he did not get. That is what I thought, but it seems he will be disappointed in this and in other bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, the gentleman from Washington fared quite well in the Interior Department bill. And he hopes that the Army of the United States will fare well in this bill. I asked my question as directly as I could of the chairman of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations if he had any legislation on this bill, and he answered squarely that there was not one speck. If there were, I would not make a point of order against it unless I felt that it were vicious or wrong; neither which it could be under the watchful eye of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]. He said he would offer no new legislation—none.

Now comes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] with new testimony. He interjects to say that the bill carries three items of legislation, two of which are limitations on appropriations in which the committee is within its rights under the Holman rule and one tiny little bit of legislation. And thus the Members learned—and there are so many here this afternoon—that there is, after all, one piece of new legislation in this very important appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ACTIVITIES

No money appropriated by this act for objects which the economic survey now being conducted by the War Department, when completed and approved, may show as not being wholly or partly required shall be available for obligation for any other object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I rise for information. The economic survey provided for in the paragraph just read must have been ordered by a prior Congress. Can the chairman of the subcommittee state in a word what that survey comprises?

Mr. BARBOUR. As the gentleman knows, the President has made recommendations, or, at least, suggestions, that economies might be effected in the War Department. Studies are being made in the War Department at this time that have not been completed. This bill carries funds for the fiscal year 1931, beginning July 1, 1930, and ending June 30, 1931. Some of these studies may be completed in the meantime, and this provision is inserted so that if it is determined by these studies that some of the purposes for which appropriations are carried in this bill are not necessary and are not carried out, then they will not be able to use the money for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is purely a limitation?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is aimed toward economy?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the chairman any information as to when the work of this survey will be completed or when a partial or complete report will be submitted?

Mr. BARBOUR. No. Some time ago a report was submitted on one study, but, as I understand, it was sent back for further study. It is progressing, I am told, along various lines and it is a sort of general survey.

Mr. STAFFORD. To what end? Merely for economy, improvement in the service, the reduction of posts, or what is the general idea?

Mr. BARBOUR. Everything is involved that may aid in bringing about greater economy in the War Department. It is not being carried on, I will state, under the direction of Congress, but it is being carried on under the direction of the President.

Mr. BRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether any of the reports or preliminary reports thus far made have been released by the War Department or are they still regarded as confidential documents?

Mr. BARBOUR. I understand they are still regarded as confidential.

Mr. BRIGGS. And that they will not be released until a final report is made with reference to all of this survey?

Mr. BARBOUR. I can not assure the gentleman what the intention is with regard to releasing them, because it is an executive survey that is being made. All we know is that this survey is being made, we know the purpose of the survey, and we wrote this provision in the bill, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, solely in the interest of economy, so that if it should be recommended that certain activities for which money is carried at the present time shall be discontinued then it will not be possible to use the money for other purposes.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand, the survey is being made by direction of the Commander in Chief of the Army, the President, and any releases would have to be authorized by him.

Mr. BARBOUR. That is my understanding.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is there any prospect of any early releases of these preliminary reports?

Mr. BARBOUR. I have no information as to that, but presume that the work will be done expeditiously.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. If this report No. 97 has an index, I do not see it. Is there an index to the report?

Mr. BARBOUR. The bill is indexed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am interested in construction at military posts. I find "barracks and quarters and other buildings and utilities" beginning in line 11, page 25. I find

"military posts" on page 23, line 21. The gentleman is perfectly willing to grant all the time that is necessary under the 5-minute rule to discuss these items when we reach them?

Mr. BARBOUR. We generally try to give all the time that is necessary under the 5-minute rule and in general debate, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And I know the gentleman in his capacity of chairman of the subcommittee does not want to trim the Army or weaken it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I have no desire to trim or weaken the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And the gentleman would like to see the Army well fed.

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes; and we provide for that in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What does the gentleman consider well fed?

Mr. BARBOUR. A ration of 50 cents a day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How much was it last year?

Mr. BARBOUR. Fifty cents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not the President by Executive order increase it from 45 cents to 50 cents?

Mr. BARBOUR. No; it was 50 cents last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But did not the President by Executive order give the soldiers a little more to eat?

Mr. BARBOUR. Two or three years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I remember that the House itself passed not so long ago bills relative to increased rations. I would like to say to the gentleman that with the declining purchasing power of the dollar and the increased cost of food, it is going to be hard to feed the Army even on 50 cents a day.

Mr. BARBOUR. Let me say to the gentleman that the Army ration is fixed by Executive order, and all we have to do is to provide the money. If the gentleman does not like the present ration he may act to have it amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope it will be amended.

Mr. BARBOUR. But do not criticize this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not criticizing the committee. But I shall try to offer such an amendment. I am simply trying to get some facts.

Mr. BARBOUR. And I am trying to give them to the gentleman, but the gentleman is criticizing the committee for something it is in no wise responsible for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I venture the assertion that if I introduced a bill to-night to make the Army ration 53 cents a day, I believe that such a bill in all likelihood would be sent down to the Bureau of the Budget to see if it interfered with the President's program, and it would come back disapproved by the Budget Bureau. It would then have a hard time to get out of committee to this floor.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Twice the House has passed a new ration bill and twice it has died in the Senate, and now it has been reintroduced in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Good. And in the meantime the soldier eats three times a day, whatever is mixed up in the mess kit.

Mr. JAMES. I do not agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am talking about the enlisted man. I have eaten some of their meals.

Mr. BARBOUR. I have been eating some of them, too.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They knew the gentleman was coming. They did not know I was coming, and I got stewed beef, watery potatoes, and aged canned peas all dished up together with greasy gravy on the side. Of course, they have lots of better meals than that—or most of them would run away.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say something about the pay of the lieutenants and the hump, but shall reserve my statements until we reach another paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take a great many shots at this bill and I intend to continue to do so as we proceed with its reading, but in this instance I want to say that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] is considerably in error. We went through this question of rations not very long ago, and the amount asked by the department was granted by Congress. This is a matter of law, and I will say that any company with proper company management with the allowance that we grant for food, with the overhead they have, not having to pay for service or for rent or for light, that the soldiers of the United States Army, where the company fund is properly managed, can eat better than the average Member of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will ask the gentleman, if we get an increased tariff of 4 cents on tomato paste, will that affect the Army ration?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is another question. When we raise the tariff, then, perhaps, we will have to raise the allowance for the Army, and in New York we will have to raise wages, because we have to eat; but let us not get into a tariff discussion just now.

I keep track of these things, and if there is anyone who likes to criticize this bill and the War Department, it is the gentleman who now has the floor, but I want to say, in all fairness, that we have been most generous with the food allowance, and I repeat that where there is proper management in any garrison, the United States soldier is the best-fed human being in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no one disputes that the United States Army is better fed than the armies of other nations of the world, and still that "best" can be bettered.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], but I have visited practically every Army post in the United States at least once as well as the Army posts in Panama, Porto Rico, and Hawaii, and with only two or three exceptions I have never seen any place where the men were not well fed, and in one of those two or three cases they had a new sergeant they were trying to break in. The American soldier is well fed. I have talked with the enlisted men, and only once or twice have I ever heard any complaint.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When the gentleman arrived—sometimes in a flying machine—at these posts did they not always know the gentleman was coming?

Mr. JAMES. No; they did not.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7955, the War Department appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 11, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Saturday, January 11, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

(10.30 a. m.)

To authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans (H. R. 6141).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

259. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill to authorize credit in the accounts of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Claims.

260. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation pertaining to the legislative establishment, for the Supreme Court Building, under the Architect of the Capitol, fiscal year 1930, in the sum of \$500,000 (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

261. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of proposed legislation affecting the use of an existing appropriation for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 250); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

262. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting herewith, for the consideration of Congress, in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C.,

title 5, sec. 266) schedules of claims amounting to \$764,355.46 allowed by various divisions for the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement (H. Doc. No. 251); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. J. Res. 144. A joint resolution authorizing the use of tribal moneys belonging to the Fort Berthold Indians of North Dakota for certain purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4813. A bill extending the period of time for homestead entries on the Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ALLGOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 322. A bill for the relief of Kenneth A. Rotharmel; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Capt. W. B. Finney; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ALLGOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 910. A bill for the relief of William H. Johns; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ALLGOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of the Charlestown Sand & Stone Co., of Elkton, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of heirs of Warren C. Vesta; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ALLGOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Maj. Lester L. Lampert; with amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of Maj. O. S. McCleary, United States Army, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ALLGOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1693. A bill to reimburse Dr. Philip Suriani; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ALLGOOD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1794. A bill to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the owners of the British steamship *Kyleakin* for damages sustained as a result of a collision between that vessel and the U. S. S. *William O'Brien*; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2011. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to settle the claims of the owners of the French steamships *P. L. M. 4* and *P. L. M. 7* for damages sustained as a result of collisions between such vessels and the U. S. S. *Henderson* and *Lake Charlotte*, and to settle the claim of the United States against the owners of the French steamship *P. L. M. 7* for damages sustained by the U. S. S. *Pennsylvanian* in a collision with the *P. L. M. 7*; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of W. J. Shirley; with amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 3863. A bill for the relief of Dr. W. H. Parsons; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4149. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Thomas G. Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 5470. A bill for the relief of Mary L. Dickson; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 6175. A bill for the relief of the Mack Copper Co., a corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WHITEHEAD: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 6414. A bill authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claim of the city of Park Place, heretofore an independent municipality but now a part of the city of Houston, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARE: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 6670. A bill for the relief of Carteret Street Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Beaufort, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 6760. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Wight; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 7069. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Viktor Pettersson; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PEAVEY: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7964. A bill to authorize the issuance of a fee patent for block 23, within the town of Lac du Flambeau, Wis., in favor of the local public-school authorities; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8414) providing for a site and public building for post-office and other Federal purposes at Haleyville, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 8415) to amend section 1505 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, relating to loss of numbers by officers of the Navy who are found not professionally qualified for promotion; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 8416) to provide free medical and surgical aid to crippled children in United States under 21 years of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8417) to amend section 305 of the World War veterans' act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 8418) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to dispose by sale of certain public land in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8419) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to dispose by sale of certain public land in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 8420) to amend the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 8421) to amend section 1860 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8422) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Washington, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 8423) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Topeka, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 8424) to provide for the creation of the colonial national monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8425) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JAMES (by request of the War Department): A bill (H. R. 8426) to amend the act entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries," approved March 2, 1929; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 8427) to constitute the libraries of State universities designated depositories for Government publications; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 8428) making an appropriation for improving the Arkansas River from Little Rock, Ark.,

to the point where it flows into the Mississippi River, for purposes of navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8429) for erection of a public building at North Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8430) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Morrilton, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 8431) for the improvement of navigation in the St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee Rivers and Lake Okeechobee, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 8432) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the free-delivery system of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes," approved January 3, 1887 (24 Stat. L. 355); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SWING: Resolution (H. Res. 119) to provide for the reprinting of House Document No. 132, Seventy-first Congress, being a letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a report covering the selection of locations deemed most suitable for a naval airship base; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 8433) granting a pension to Sallie Bloodsaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 8434) granting an increase of pension to Mary Becker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 8435) granting an honorable discharge to John Auge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWL: A bill (H. R. 8436) for the relief of John Sanford Tillotson; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 8437) granting a pension to Lillah J. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 8438) for the relief of J. T. Bonner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 8439) to provide for examination and survey of the Big Blue River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESTEP: A bill (H. R. 8440) for the relief of Henry A. Leake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 8441) for the relief of James Ryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 8442) for the relief of the Noank Shipyard (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8443) granting an increase of pension to Dock Willis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALSEY: A bill (H. R. 8444) granting an increase of pension to Mathilda E. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8445) to provide for the appointment as a warrant officer of the Regular Army of Sidney B. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 8446) granting an increase of pension to Frances Luse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 8447) granting a medal of honor to Charles M. Ashbrook; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 8448) granting a pension to Mary Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8449) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Reley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 8450) granting an increase of pension to Emma B. Varnum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8451) for the relief of W. H. Bradford & Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8452) granting an increase of pension to Matilda Bandholtz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 8453) granting a pension to Sarah Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 8454) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the Charleston Museum, of Charleston, S. C., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, name plate, and silver service of the battleship-cruiser *Charleston* that is now, or may be, in his custody; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAGRADY: A bill (H. R. 8455) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca H. Riddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 8456) for the relief of Michael McCabe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8457) granting a pension to Florence E. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 8458) granting a pension to Jesse J. Stanberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 8459) granting a pension to Jennie Bateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 8460) granting a pension to Jessie May Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 8461) for the relief of the Concrete Steel Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8462) granting an increase of pension to Adelaide B. Kinter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 8463) granting an increase of pension to Annie Rees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8464) granting an increase of pension to Ella J. Aber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8465) granting an increase of pension to Agnes M. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 8466) for the relief of David Albert Robeson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THURSTON: A bill (H. R. 8467) granting a pension to Dora Anders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2749. By Mr. BRUMM: Petition of citizens of Minersville, Schuylkill County, Pa., urging immediate action on the pending bill to provide an increase of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2750. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition signed by 69 voters of Toledo, Ohio, urging the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2751. By Mr. CRADDOCK: Petition of Charles H. May and 56 other citizens of Breckenridge County, Ky., urging that favorable action be taken by Congress on House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

2752. Also, petition of Lillie M. Autry, Minnie Vincent, Henrietta Swift, and others, of Grayson County, Ky., urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2753. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition signed by Robert M. Greenshields and 81 other residents of Romeo, Mich., urging increase in pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2754. By Mr. EATON of Colorado: Petition signed by 21 voters of Denver, Colo., petitioning for the passage of House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2755. By Mr. DOUGHTON: Petition of citizens of Albemarle, N. C., urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase in pensions to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2756. Also, petition of citizens of Badin and Palmerville, N. C., urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase of pension to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2757. Also, petition of citizens of Concord, N. C., urging the passage of House bill 2562, granting an increase in pensions to Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2758. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Petition of Enos Hale and other citizens of Trego, Mont., urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2759. By Mr. FENN: Petitions of 24 citizens of Hartford County, Conn., and 36 citizens of South Manchester, Conn., favoring the establishment of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

2760. By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of 112 citizens of Dayton, Montgomery County, Ohio, praying for early consideration and passage of House bill 2562, to increase the pensions of veterans of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2761. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of citizens of Martin County, Ind., urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2762. By Mr. HALL of Mississippi: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn, Miss., for speedy consideration and passage of bills providing for increased rates of pension of the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2763. By Mr. HOPKINS: Petition headed by Charles Reys, of 222 Cherokee Street, St. Joseph, Mo., and signed by many people living in St. Joseph, petitioning for a more equitable pension to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2764. By Mr. HUDDLESTON: Petition of numerous citizens of Jefferson County, Ala., in behalf of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, being measures for the relief of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2765. Also, petition of City Council of the town of Tarrant, Ala., in behalf of more liberal pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2766. By Mr. KADING: Resolution adopted by the Twenty-fourth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin State Union, American Society of Equity, held December 10-12, 1929, at Portage, Wis., relative to securing more favorable legislation for the farming industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2767. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of certain citizens of Bethel, in the sixth congressional district of Ohio, urging the passage of legislation for the further relief of Civil War soldiers and widows of soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2768. By Mr. KOPP: Petition of many residents of Washington County, Iowa, urging increased pensions for survivors and widows of veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2769. Also, petition of many citizens of Burlington and Stockport, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increasing rates of pensions to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2770. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition signed by citizens of Montello, Wis., requesting immediate and favorable action on House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2771. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of numerous citizens of Clark, Randolph County, Mo., urging the enactment of more liberal pension legislation for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2772. By Mrs. McCORMICK of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Cook County, Ill., favoring pending legislation for increase of pension to veterans of the Spanish-American War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2773. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the city of Chicago, Ill., and suburbs, urging the passage of House bill 2562, for the relief of Spanish-American War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2774. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petition signed by 11 voters of Hixson, Hamilton County, Tenn., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the bill for increase in pensions of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2775. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Temple Beth El, of Stamford, in the State of Connecticut, in opposition to any change in the calendar which in any manner endangers the fixity of the Sabbath; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2776. Also, petition of the board of selectmen of Bethel, in the State of Connecticut, favoring the passage of legislation to increase the pensions of veterans of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2777. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of citizens of Jackson and Lenawee Counties, Mich., favoring Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing increased rates of pension for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2778. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of James Carter, Verne Adams, and 56 others, for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period, as provided in Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, now pending; to the Committee on Pensions.

2779. Also, petition of Chas. W. Grissom, and 24 others, urging favorable action on Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased pension rates to veterans who served in the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

2780. By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: Petition of citizens of Saugerties and Malden, Ulster County, N. Y., urging passage of legislation to increase the pensions of veterans of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2781. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of citizens of Novinger, Mo., for increased pensions to Civil War veterans and the widows of veterans of that war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

2782. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of Brawley, Imperial County, Calif., expressing their interest in the passage of

Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2783. Also, petition of citizens of Perris, Calif., expressing their interest in the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

2784. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of W. M. Temple, and 85 citizens of Aliquippa, Beaver County, Pa., for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing increased pensions for the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2785. Also, petition of Simeon D. Morrison and 47 citizens of Butler County, Pa., for the passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing increased pensions for men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2786. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from citizens of Leadville, Colo., urging passage of House bill 2562, for increase of pensions of soldiers of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2787. By Mr. WARREN: Petition of L. W. Godwin and 142 others, of Farmville, N. C., in favor of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pensions to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2788. Also, petition of R. H. Bachman and 32 others, of Chowan County, N. C., asking Congress to appoint a commission to formulate plans for a centennial celebration in 1937 of Horace Mann's acceptance of the secretaryship of the Massachusetts State Board of Education; to the Committee on Education.

2789. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of citizens of Bucks County, Pa., in behalf of increased pensions to veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2790. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of sundry citizens of Brockton, Mass., urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increases in pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

2791. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of citizens of Downingtown and Media, Pa., for passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pensions for veterans of the Spanish War; to the Committee on Pensions.

2792. By Mr. YON: Petition of L. H. Buchanan and E. L. Baxter, of Chipley, Washington County, Fla., praying for the passage of House bill 2562, for increased Spanish War pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

SATURDAY, January 11, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, January 6, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7960) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed, pursuant to law, as members of the Board of Visitors on the part of the Senate to the Naval Academy for the year 1930 Senators GOLDSBOROUGH, ALLEN, BROUSSARD, and TYDINGS.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM T. STILES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of William T. Stiles against the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PROPOSED TARIFF RATES ON SILK PRODUCTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Silk Association of America (Inc.), which, with the accompanying correspondence, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: